

Homeric Roles for Virgilian Contexts:
Aeneas and Turnus in *Aeneid* 12

A Senior Honors Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for graduation
with research distinction in Classics in the undergraduate colleges of the Ohio State University

by

Justin Vorhis

Ohio State University
May 2010

Project Advisor: Bruce Heiden, Department of Greek and Latin

Chapter 1: Introduction

In *Aeneid* 6, the Sibyl delivers an important prophecy to Aeneas. As the Sibyl begins to foretell the coming events in Latium, she declares: “*alius Latio iam partus Achilles, // natus et ipse dea*, another Achilles has already been born in Latium, he himself also the son of a goddess” (*Aen.* 6.89-90).¹ By mentioning an *alius Achilles*, the Sibyl presages not only the second, Iliadic movement of the *Aeneid*,² but also the complex problem of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles. Who, the Sibyl’s prophecy demands, is the poem’s *alius Achilles*? Who is the poem’s corresponding *alius Hector*? While the Sibyl’s prophecy seems initially to suggest that Turnus is the poem’s *alius Achilles*, Aeneas its *alius Hector*,³ Vergil in fact complicates these simple identifications. In Book 8, for instance, Aeneas seems to play the role of Achilles when he receives an elaborate shield made by Vulcan; in Book 9, though, Turnus explicitly declares himself the new Achilles. However, beyond the basic question of Homeric role identification, the Sibyl’s prophecy implicitly forces the reader to confront a larger and deeper question as well: What does it mean for Aeneas and Turnus to “play” or “assume” the roles of Achilles, Hector, or other Homeric characters? How, in other words, do Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles affect the reader’s understanding of Aeneas, Turnus, and the *Aeneid* itself?

While investigation of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles may begin at almost any point in Vergil’s *Iliad*, *Aeneid* 12, the final book of the poem, represents particularly fertile ground for

¹ Quotations from the *Aeneid* are from R. A. B. Mynors, *Vergili Opera*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969); quotations from the *Iliad* are from David B. Munro and Thomas W. Allen, *Homeri Opera I-II*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920); quotations from the *Argonautica* are from Hermann Frankel, *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica* (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1967). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

² R.O.A.M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Vergil’s Aeneid*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987) 108.

³ For the standard interpretation of the Sibyl’s prophecy of *alius Achilles*, see R. D. Williams, *Vergil’s Aeneid I-VI*, (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1995) 465; for a novel interpretation, see Steven C. Smith, “Remembering the Enemy: Narrative, Focalization, and Vergil’s Portrait of Achilles,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-), Vol. 129, (1999) 258.

such an investigation. First and foremost, Book 12, as the most “Homeric” book of the poem,⁴ features Aeneas and Turnus in a particularly wide array of Homeric roles. Early in Book 12, for instance, Aeneas and Turnus nearly reenact the duel of Menelaus and Paris in *Iliad* 3, with Aeneas in the role of both Agamemnon and Menelaus, Turnus in the role of Paris. Later, after this initial duel is aborted, Aeneas and Turnus begin to reenact the famous duel of Achilles and Hector in *Iliad* 22, with Aeneas in the role of Achilles, Turnus in the role of Hector. Second, Book 12, even apart from its distinctive Homeric character, stands as one of the most important books of the poem. As the final book of the *Aeneid*, Book 12 contains two of the most meaningful and significant episodes in the poem: Jupiter’s reconciliation with Juno and, more relevant for the purposes of this investigation, Aeneas’ slaying of Turnus. Thus, in light of these two considerations, this paper will investigate the meaning and significance of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles within the context of Book 12.

The paper will be divided into four chapters. The remainder of the first chapter, the Introduction, will review the existing scholarship on the subject of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles and introduce the methodology that will be used in carrying out this investigation. The second chapter, Aeneas’ Homeric Roles in Book 12, will consider three of Aeneas’ Homeric roles: Agamemnon, Hector, and Achilles. The third chapter, Turnus’ Homeric Roles in Book 12, will likewise consider two of Turnus’ Homeric roles: Paris and Hector. Finally, the fourth chapter, the Conclusion, will summarize the investigation as a whole and explore in greater depth the investigation’s findings and implications.

Bibliographic Review

⁴ Robin R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil*, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1974) 82.

Unlike most areas of Vergilian study, the subject of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12 has received insufficient treatment. Scholarship on the subject of Homeric roles in the *Aeneid* has tended to look at Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in the second half of the *Aeneid* generally, rather than in Book 12 specifically. This scholarship has focused primarily on establishing *which* Homeric role(s) Aeneas and Turnus play in Vergil's *Iliad*. While not particularly large, this scholarship has nevertheless been quite diverse in its findings and conclusions. According to some, Aeneas plays the role of Achilles, Turnus that of Hector; according to others, Aeneas plays the role of Hector, Turnus that of Achilles; according to others still, Aeneas and Turnus play multiple Homeric roles not limited to Achilles and Hector. The fundamental problem with this scholarship, though, has been its neglect of the larger and deeper question about Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles: Why do Aeneas and Turnus play these Homeric roles? What, in effect, do these Homeric roles reveal about Aeneas, Turnus, and the *Aeneid*? Fortunately, a second and smaller branch of scholarship has dealt with this larger and deeper question. Before dealing with this second branch of scholarship, however, this section will present the first branch of scholarship, the scholarship on the subject of which Homeric roles Aeneas and Turnus play in Vergil's *Iliad*.

Among the first articles to address the subject of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles was John William Spaeth Jr.'s "Hector's Successor in the *Aeneid*."⁵ In his article, Spaeth argues that Aeneas functions as Hector's logical successor throughout the *Aeneid*, that Aeneas, in other words, plays the role of Hector throughout the *Aeneid*. In support of his argument, Spaeth points to several episodes in the *Aeneid* that suggest a transfer of legitimacy and authority from Hector to Aeneas. These episodes include both Hector's visit to Aeneas on the night of Troy's fall and

⁵ John William Spaeth Jr., "Hector's Successor in the *Aeneid*," *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 6 (Mar., 1951).

Misenus' transfer of loyalty to Aeneas in the aftermath of Hector's death. While such episodes do indeed suggest a correspondence between Aeneas and Hector, they do not necessarily mean that Aeneas is the *Aeneid's* Hector, that Aeneas plays the role of Hector. In his discussion of Book 12, however, Spaeth insists on this point:

Though it is true that Aeneas dealt Turnus his death-blow when he caught sight of the belt of young Pallas, whom Turnus had cruelly slain and despoiled, much as Hector had died at Achilles' hands for having killed Patroclus and donned his armor, there are many more essential factors in the equation that make it abundantly clear that Virgil's Hector is Aeneas, and his Achilles the impulsive Turnus. This fact is too evident and has been too often remarked to require further discussion here.⁶

Unfortunately, Spaeth adduces no evidence to support his claim. In fact, by mentioning Pallas, he provides evidence to the contrary, evidence that Aeneas' true Homeric role at the end of the poem is as Achilles. Ultimately, while it may have been "abundantly clear" to Spaeth how Aeneas is the *Aeneid's* Hector, Turnus its Achilles, he fails to make it sufficiently clear for his readers.

In "Achilles as Model for Aeneas," L. A. MacKay offers a more grounded—if still one-sided—analysis of Homeric roles in the second half of the *Aeneid*.⁷ As the title of his article suggests, MacKay believes that Aeneas plays the role of Achilles in Vergil's *Iliad*. In making the case for Achilles, MacKay acknowledges the difficulty readers of the *Aeneid* may have in seeing the selfish and willful Greek hero as the model for the father of the Roman people. MacKay suggests, however, that this difficulty stems more from readers' incomplete understanding of Homer's Achilles than anything else: "Later readers of the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* may, however, have been unable to appreciate adequately Virgil's use of Achilles because...their

⁶ Ibid. 280.

⁷ L. A. MacKay, "Achilles as Model for Aeneas," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 88, (1957).

attention has been dominated more than his by the first three quarters of the *Iliad*.”⁸ The Achilles of the last quarter of the *Iliad*, MacKay contends, is a different man from the Achilles of the first three quarters. Unlike the petulant Achilles of *Iliad* 1, the Achilles of *Iliad* 22 is a man with a higher mission, a man ready to stake everything—including his own life—on the fulfillment of that mission. From there, MacKay poses a simple question: “Is not this, in essence, what we see in Aeneas?”⁹ For MacKay, Aeneas becomes Achilles by poem’s end inasmuch as he, too, bears the burden of an overwhelming mission; inasmuch as he, too, is past the point of knowing joy or satisfaction from life. While MacKay’s argument does not account for all of the similarities and differences between Aeneas and Achilles, he nevertheless moves the discussion about Homeric roles in the second half of the *Aeneid* in a more sensible—and defensible—direction.

In “Vergil’s Second *Iliad*,” W. S. Anderson takes a wider view of Homeric roles in the second half of the *Aeneid*.¹⁰ Whereas Spaeth argues for Aeneas as Hector and MacKay for Aeneas as Achilles, Anderson maintains that Aeneas and Turnus play several Homeric roles throughout Vergil’s *Iliad*. While Anderson thus advocates a more complex view of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles, he nevertheless argues for an underlying order and coherence to their roles as well. This underlying order and coherence, Anderson argues, can be seen by paying attention to the *Aeneid*’s narrative arc, rather than the utterances of its characters. The narrative arc of Vergil’s *Iliad*—from the Trojan’s landing in Latium to Turnus’ death—fairly consistently puts Aeneas in the role not just of Achilles, but of Agamemnon and Menelaus; Turnus in the role not just of Hector, but of Paris. In other words, the narrative arc casts Aeneas and the Trojans in the role of Homer’s Greeks, Turnus and the Latins in the role of Homer’s Trojans. The problem with this view, Anderson acknowledges, is that Vergil’s characters seem to think differently.

⁸ Ibid. 12.

⁹ Ibid. 14.

¹⁰ W. S. Anderson, “Vergil’s Second *Iliad*,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 88 (1957).

Again and again throughout Vergil's *Iliad*, characters—notably Juno, Turnus, and Amata—express views on which Homeric role(s) they or other characters are playing. However, as Anderson shows, these views are almost always false and untenable. In Book 9, for instance, Turnus, as noted above, declares himself to be the new Achilles. However, the circumstances in which Turnus makes this vaunt suggest otherwise. Turnus makes his vaunt while leading an assault on the Trojan camp—something for which Hector, and not Achilles, was famous in the *Iliad*. In short, Anderson concludes that “Turnus fabricates a parallelism which cannot be substantiated by the facts as Vergil presents them.”¹¹ Ultimately, by presenting a more comprehensive and complex view of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles than those considered above, Anderson greatly advances the scholarly debate on the subject.

In “Aeneas, Turnus, and Achilles,” Thomas Van Nortwick builds on Anderson's work to propose a still more nuanced view of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Vergil's *Iliad*.¹² Writing in response to Anderson's work, Van Nortwick attempts “to modify this [Anderson's] view by showing how Achilles serves as the model for both Aeneas and Turnus right up to the end of the *Aeneid*.”¹³ In order to demonstrate the still greater complexity of the subject of Homeric roles in the second half of the *Aeneid*, Van Nortwick begins by looking at Turnus in Books 7-11. Throughout Books 7-11, Van Nortwick observes, Turnus plays the role, however briefly, of multiple Homeric heroes besides Hector and Paris, including Ajax, Patroclus and Achilles. In Book 9, for instance, Van Nortwick shows that Turnus evokes three Homeric heroes in succession. Initially, Turnus resembles the Achilles of *Iliad* 18 whom Iris visits and rouses to action; then, during the assault on the Trojan camp, he assumes the role of the Hector of *Iliad* 8

¹¹ Ibid. 24.

¹² Thomas Van Nortwick, “Aeneas, Turnus, and Achilles,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-), Vol. 110, (1980).

¹³ Ibid. 303.

and 12; finally, in his slow retreat before the Trojans, he comes to resemble the Ajax of *Iliad* 11. Moreover, Van Nortwick argues, even in Book 12 Turnus has not just one Homeric role, but multiple Homeric roles. While Turnus clearly plays the role of Hector to a large extent, he also plays the roles, at various times, of Achilles, Menelaus, and Paris. In short, by poem's end "Turnus has come to represent in his final opposition to Aeneas a complex mixture of forces."¹⁴ Van Nortwick then proceeds to show the same multiplicity and complexity of Aeneas' roles. While Van Nortwick acknowledges Aeneas' role as Achilles, he shows that Aeneas, like Turnus, plays more than one Homeric role in Vergil's *Iliad*. In Book 12, for instance, Vergil casts Aeneas during his duel with Turnus not just in the role of Achilles, but in the perplexing roles of Asteropaeus and Paris. Van Nortwick concludes: "Taken together, these allusions again seem to qualify the secure identification of Aeneas with Achilles, Turnus with Hector, and to blur the roles of victor and vanquished."¹⁵ Ultimately, by acknowledging the even greater multiplicity and complexity of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles, Van Nortwick advances the scholarly conversation on the subject still further.

Finally, in *Virgil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*, K. W. Gransden stakes out a position between Anderson and Van Nortwick.¹⁶ Like Anderson, Gransden maintains that there is an overall pattern to Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles. In Gransden's view, Aeneas largely plays the role of Homer's Greek heroes, from Achilles and Diomedes to Agamemnon and Menelaus; Turnus, on the other hand, largely plays the role of Homer's Trojan heroes, Hector and Paris. However, in Gransden's view, as in Van Nortwick's view, Aeneas and Turnus also play roles that do not fit within their respective Greek and Trojan "personas." For instance, Gransden believes that Aeneas briefly plays the role of Priam in the beginning of Book 12,

¹⁴ Ibid. 308.

¹⁵ Ibid. 312.

¹⁶ K. W. Gransden, *Virgil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Turnus that of Achilles. Thus, Gransden's view of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles strikes a reasonable balance between Anderson's and Van Nortwick's views. Gransden's view is strict enough to maintain that there is a coherent pattern to Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Vergil's *Iliad*, but flexible enough to admit that there are exceptions to this pattern.

While the scholarship discussed above may seem to indicate a hopelessly convoluted subject, it in fact points towards an important point for students of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles. The scholarship discussed above, for all of its disagreement and conflicting conclusions, indicates that the subject of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles is complex and complicated. Contrary to Spaeth's and MacKay's view, Aeneas and Turnus do not play just one Homeric role in Vergil's *Iliad*; instead, as Anderson, Van Nortwick, and Gransden argue, they play different Homeric roles at different times. However, the notion that Aeneas and Turnus play different Homeric roles at different times requires fine tuning as well. While Aeneas and Turnus do indeed play a multiplicity of Homeric roles throughout Vergil's *Iliad*, some roles are clearly more important and more consistent than others (e.g. Aeneas' role as Achilles and Turnus' role as Hector throughout Books 7-12); some roles are clearly less important and less consistent than others (e.g. Aeneas' role as Asteropaeus in Book 12, Turnus's role as Ajax in Book 9). In other words, Aeneas and Turnus play a small number of "primary" Homeric roles and a large number of "secondary" Homeric roles in Vergil's *Iliad*.

Yet, as important—even indispensable—as this point about the multiplicity of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles is, the larger and deeper question about these Homeric roles remains. Why do Aeneas and Turnus play these Homeric roles, whether one role or multiple roles, whether primary roles or secondary roles? What, in other words, do these Homeric roles reveal about Aeneas, Turnus, and the *Aeneid* itself? Spaeth, MacKay, Anderson, Van Nortwick, and

Gransden are largely silent on this question; the answers that they do provide tend to be part of their conclusions rather than their main arguments. Fortunately, a second branch of scholarship on the subject of the Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12—primarily the work of W. R. Johnson, R. O. A. M. Lyne, and Katherine King—addresses these deeper questions. Hence the remainder of this section will consider this second branch of scholarship.

In *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*, W. R. Johnson begins to tackle this larger and deeper question about Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles.¹⁷ In his discussion of Book 12, Johnson manages to elucidate one of Turnus' primary roles in Book 12, his role as Hector. Johnson begins the section with a revealing comment: "Here as elsewhere in this study we begin asking our questions by focusing on Vergil's transformation of his Homeric models."¹⁸ For Johnson, the reason to study Vergil's Homeric models—the reason, in this case, to study Turnus' role as Hector—is because of the clarifying contrast such study provides for understanding Turnus and the *Aeneid* itself. In Turnus' case, the comparison between him and Hector reveals a crucial dissimilarity between the two men: Turnus, unlike Hector, is a victim by poem's end, a man bereft of his dignity and honor. Johnson observes:

In short, Hector goes down swinging; there is not the vaguest hint that he is merely the victim of a force, whether human or divine, that has bereft him of his nobility and humanity...Because of Vergil's compression and alteration of his model, this heroic emphasis disappears and is replaced with an ugly, unheroic pathos.¹⁹

This fact about Turnus, Johnson goes on to argue, is in fact the key to understanding the end of the poem. For Turnus' victimization highlights the dark reality about the end of the *Aeneid*: the triumph and centrality of Juno, the goddess who makes Turnus—and ultimately Aeneas—a

¹⁷ W. R. Johnson, *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976).

¹⁸ Ibid. 116.

¹⁹ Ibid. 115.

victim of her malevolent design. Thus, for Johnson, Turnus' role as Hector is meaningful and significant inasmuch as it reveals Turnus for who he really is; inasmuch as it points to the darkness at the heart of the poem's conclusion.

In *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*, R. O. A. M. Lyne provides a more extensive investigation of the larger and deeper question about Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles. Unlike Johnson, Lyne manages to shed light on the Homeric roles of both Turnus *and* Aeneas in Book 12. In the case of Turnus, Lyne focuses on elucidating one of Turnus' secondary roles in Book 12: Turnus' role as Diomedes. In Book 11, Lyne observes, Turnus shows that he thinks of himself as a new Diomedes. Speaking before the Latin council, Turnus vows that Aeneas' mother, Venus, will not be there to save him again, as she did in the *Iliad*. What Turnus fails to mention, however, is that it was Diomedes from whom Aeneas had to be saved in *Iliad* 5. Therefore, for Turnus to boast that Aeneas will not be rescued again by Venus is, in some sense, for him to begin to assume the role of Diomedes. In Book 12, however, Turnus fully assumes the role. In his final clash with Aeneas, Turnus attempts to wound Aeneas with a stone that "two men of today" could not lift—the very feat that Diomedes performed to wound Aeneas in the *Iliad*. However, in Book 12, Turnus performs this feat with drastically different results. Far from wounding Aeneas, Turnus fails to make the stone even take flight. For Lyne, the Turnus-Diomedes correspondence therefore highlights the limits and false pretensions of Turnus. Lyne concludes: "So while Turnus sees himself as a potentially successful Diomedes, Vergil presents him as a discomfited and defeated Diomedes... Turnus, it transpires, is not quite the great and successful hero he thinks he is. And the defeat of the aspiring Diomedes may seem in a way to even the score, repaying the original Diomedes for his success in the fifth book of the *Iliad*."²⁰

²⁰ Lyne (1987) 134.

Thus, Turnus' role as Diomedes—much like his role as Hector discussed above—highlights fundamental facts and realities about Turnus.

Similarly, Lyne sheds light on one of Aeneas' "primary" Homeric roles in Book 12: Achilles. In investigating Aeneas' role as Achilles, Lyne begins by identifying the basic, surface-level meaning of this role. Aeneas' role as Achilles, Lyne maintains, assures the reader that Aeneas will ultimately be victorious in Vergil's *Iliad*. However, in Lyne's terms, Aeneas' role as Achilles provokes "further voices,"²¹ too. At the end of Book 12, Aeneas seems poised to live out Anchises' famous formulation of what it means to be Roman: "*parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*, to spare the conquered and war down the proud" (*Aen.* 6.853). Having wounded and incapacitated Turnus, Aeneas can fairly claim to have warred down the proud; all that remains for the establishment of peace is for him to spare the conquered, to spare Turnus. Yet, as Lyne observes, just as Aeneas seems ready to consummate his role as the clement Augustan ruler, he reverts to the savage Homeric role of Achilles. When Aeneas sees Turnus wearing the belt of Pallas, Aeneas' young ward whom Turnus killed earlier in the poem, he flies into a fit of rage and slays Turnus. While there is no question that Achilles, within the heroic framework of the *Iliad*, is justified in his vengeance and killing of Hector, Lyne argues that there is a real question about the justification of Aeneas' vengeance and killing of Turnus. Lyne writes:

For Aeneas another goal besides vengeance has been proposed [e.g., Anchises' dictum quoted above]. And has not the proud been rendered subject, a candidate for clemency? And would not clemency be more conducive to peace than killing? Questions are provoked, troubling questions; Aeneas, focused at the end of the poem in the role of Achilles, disturbs."²²

²¹ For a fuller description of the concept of "further voices," and the corresponding concept of the "epic voice," see Lyne (1987) 1-3. Essentially, the "Epic voice" is Lyne's term for the objective, patriotic, and optimistic strain in the *Aeneid*; "further voice" is his term for the subjective, subversive, and pessimistic strain in the *Aeneid*.

²² Lyne (1987) 112-113.

Thus, like Turnus' Homeric roles discussed above, Aeneas' Homeric role as Achilles serves to highlight the true nature of Aeneas. Among other things, Aeneas' role as Achilles reveals the passion and anger to which Aeneas is still prone; reveals Aeneas' shortcomings as the Augustan ruler that the reader expects him to be by poem's end.

In "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's *Aeneid*," Katherine King advances the discussion of Aeneas' role as Achilles still further.²³ Like Lyne, King sees Aeneas' role as Achilles as ultimately disturbing and subversive. In King's view, however, Vergil makes Aeneas' role as Achilles disturbing and subversive not by inviting the reader to compare and contrast Aeneas with Homer's Achilles, but by inviting the reader to compare and contrast Aeneas with his own Vergilian Achilles. Unlike Homer's Achilles, the Achilles of the *Aeneid*, King demonstrates, is a demonic figure, a symbol of the destructive power of anger, passion, and war itself. King writes: "The picture of Achilles and of the *Iliad* that emerges from the twenty explicit references in the first half of the *Aeneid* is almost totally negative. Achilles is the unyielding...ferocious...warrior of *Iliad* 20-21; he is the preeminent killer of Trojans...and of Hector in particular..."²⁴ Thus, Vergil's Achilles stands as the antithesis of Vergil's Aeneas. Whereas Achilles stands for anger, passion, and irrationality, Aeneas, as the father of the Roman people, stands for a new set of values: *pietas*, duty and compassion, and *ratio*, reason and rationality. Yet, as King shows, it is precisely this role as Achilles that Vergil has Aeneas assume in Book 10. In the wake of Pallas' death, Aeneas, in King's terms, becomes "fused" with Achilles, becomes an agent of anger, passion, and destruction. However, as King also notes, Vergil does not have Aeneas stay fused with Achilles forever; he allows Aeneas to play the role on and off, allows Aeneas to alternate between a Homeric persona and a Roman persona.

²³ Katherine King, "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's *Aeneid*," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 9 (1982).

²⁴ Ibid. 34.

At poem's end, though, the alternation stops. Aeneas, King observes, once again assumes the role of Achilles as he savagely kills Turnus, but this time there is no going back. By poem's end, Aeneas has fully become Achilles, has fully become the enemy of his own ideals and values. Thus, for King, while Achilles serves as foil for Aeneas on paper, he serves as model for Aeneas in reality.

While Johnson, Lyne, and King go further than any of the scholars considered above in terms of offering answers to the deeper questions about Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12, much work remains to be done. First, their individual assessments of the meaning and significance of Aeneas' role as Achilles and Turnus' role as Hector and Diomedes are far from conclusive, far from the last word on the subject. Vergil is anything but a simple poet and the *Aeneid* is anything but a simple poem. Therefore, it is unwise to think that Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12 would admit of one meaning, and one meaning alone. Second, many of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12 have yet to be studied with an eye to their meaning and significance. For instance, Aeneas' role as Agamemnon and Turnus' role as Paris at the beginning of Book 12 remain unexamined in this way. Thus, this paper aims to do two things: (1) To reexamine the meaning and significance of Aeneas' and Turnus' "primary" Homeric roles in Book 12 (e.g., Aeneas-Achilles and Turnus-Hector); (2) To examine the meaning and significance of several of Aeneas' and Turnus' "secondary," and previously unexamined, Homeric roles in Book 12 (e.g., Aeneas-Agamemnon, Aeneas-Hector, and Turnus-Paris).

Methodology:

The subject of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12 is fundamentally a question about the *Aeneid's* connection to the Homeric poems. In order to know how to interpret Aeneas' assumption of the role of Achilles in Book 12, for instance, it is first necessary to know something about Vergil's creative purpose and artistic technique in modeling the *Aeneid* on the Homeric poems. Thus, this section will begin by presenting three prominent interpretive paradigms that have been used to explain the *Aeneid's* connection to the Homeric poems: the Imitation, Genre, and Allusion paradigms.²⁵ Of these three, the Allusion paradigm, which posits textual meaning and significance in the *Aeneid's* connections to the Homeric poems, will be shown to be the most suitable paradigm for this paper. From there, this section will then present a basic methodology for studying allusion that will be used in conducting the investigation into Aeneas' and Turnus' roles in Book 12.

Among the oldest of the interpretive paradigms used to explain the *Aeneid's* connection to the Homeric poems is the Imitation paradigms. Based on the Imitation paradigm, similarities between the *Aeneid* and the Homeric poems stem from Vergil's personal regard for Homer and consequent desire to follow in Homer's poetic footsteps.²⁶ In its simplest form, the Imitation paradigm maintains that if Homer includes something, Vergil will include something similar. For example, just as Homer includes an extensive description of the divinely made shield of his protagonist, Achilles, so does Vergil include an extensive description of the divinely made shield of his protagonist, Aeneas. While the two shields differ in many ways, the Imitation paradigm insists that their fundamental similarities far outweigh their differences. Both shields are commissioned by the hero's mother; both are made by Hephaestus/Vulcan; both are the most

²⁵ These are not official terms for these three ways of understanding the *Aeneid's* connection to the Homeric poems, but merely my own terms.

²⁶ For a prominent proponent of the Imitation paradigm, see Servius, *The Commentaries on Aeneid I-II: Volume II*, (American Philological Association, 1946) 4. Servius maintained that one of Vergil's primary aims in writing the *Aeneid* was "*Homerum imitari*, to imitate Homer."

elaborate ekphrasis of their respective poems. Thus, according to the Imitation paradigm, the shield of Aeneas is simply an impressive recreation of the shield of Achilles, simply a reverent nod to Homer.

The Imitation paradigm, however, fails to explain the full extent of the *Aeneid's* connection with the Homeric poems. Since antiquity, the term “imitation” has been felt to imply a denigration of the artist’s integrity.²⁷ Deference replaces inspiration; modeling replaces creativity. While certain Vergilian scholars have regarded Vergil’s Homeric program as evidence of a lack of poetic inspiration and creativity,²⁸ the majority of scholars has disagreed with that assessment. For most scholars, Vergil’s close connection to Homer does not suggest a derivative poet, but rather a “meticulous scholar and a conscientious craftsman.”²⁹ In writing the *Aeneid*, as Robin Shlunk observes, Vergil aimed not just to imitate Homer, but to rival him “both in the overall purpose of his epic as well as in the finest and most minute of poetic details.”³⁰ In this sense, then, it is not sufficient to say that the shield of Aeneas is merely a copy or imitation of the shield of Achilles. The shield of Aeneas, after all, functions on several Homeric and non-Homeric levels simultaneously. On the one hand, the shield of Aeneas, like the shield of Achilles, functions both as a symbol of the cosmos and as a reminder of the divine favor in which the hero is held; on the other hand, however, the shield of Aeneas has at least two non-Homeric functions: it works as a symbol of Aeneas’ divinely allotted mission and as a

²⁷ For the history of the term “imitation,” see Gerald F. Else, “Imitation,” *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Alex Preminger, Frank J. Warnke, and O. B. Hardison Jr. editors, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974) 380.

²⁸ For discussion of Vergil’s ancient detractors, see R. J. Tarrant, “Aspects of Virgil’s Reception in Antiquity,” *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, Charles Martindale ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 59; for discussion of Vergil’s modern detractors, see Antonie Wlosok’s “Preface” to Richard Heinz’ *Vergil’s Epic Technique*, (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993) x-xii.

²⁹ Shlunk (1974) 1.

³⁰ Ibid. 1.

celebration of Rome herself. In short, as seen in this one example, the Imitation paradigm simply does not go far enough in explaining the *Aeneid*'s connection to the Homeric poems.

Similar to—but more sophisticated than—the Imitation paradigm is the Genre paradigm.³¹ According to the Genre paradigm, the *Aeneid* exhibits its close connection to the Homeric poems not because of Vergil's desire to imitate Homer, but because of the type of poem Vergil set out to write.³² The *Aeneid*, like the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, is an epic poem. Therefore, according to the Genre paradigm, the *Aeneid* necessarily contains certain "features" common to all epic poems: battles, similes, etc. The shield of Aeneas, as the most elaborate ekphrasis of the poem, is simply one of these epic "features." In "The Virgilian Intertext," Joseph Farrell neatly summarizes this view of the shield of Aeneas: "Book 8 of the *Aeneid* ends with one of Virgil's most obvious allusions: the description of a shield fashioned for Aeneas by Vulcan, which is clearly modeled on Achilles' shield in *Iliad* 18...Some would stop there, regarding the allusion as generic in character, i.e. as a mark of the poem's participation in the epic genre."³³ Thus, based on the Genre paradigm, Vergil includes the shield of Aeneas because, in a certain sense, he has to include it; the epic genre calls for a divinely made shield to serve as the ekphrastic centerpiece of the poem, and Vergil dutifully obliges.

However, like the Imitation paradigm, the Genre paradigm suffers from significant problems, too. Beginning in the 20th century, structuralist literary critics began to reevaluate the

³¹ The "Genre paradigm" discussed here is based primarily on structuralist genre criticism.

³² Frans De Bruyn, "Genre Criticism," *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, Irena R. Makaryk ed., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995) 82. "For the structuralists, genres are not systems of classification but codes of communication."

³³ Joseph Farrell, "The Virgilian Intertext," *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, Charles Martindale ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 224. In fairness to Farrell it must be acknowledged that he does in fact proceed to argue for greater depth and meaning to the shield of Aeneas. However, his initial comments on the shield of Aeneas are a useful illustration of the Genre paradigm's basic viewpoint.

long-held conception of genres as systems of classification.³⁴ For structuralist critics, genres became natural linguistic processes—veritable natural laws of literature—rather than descriptive categories. In the words of Jonathan Culler, the prominent American structuralist, genres “are a set of literary norms to which texts may be related and by virtue of which they become meaningful and coherent.”³⁵ In the structuralist view, genres are therefore the *sine qua non* of textual meaning and reader understanding. However, common sense argues against the structuralists’ binding and rigid conception of genre. First, not all poetry fits neatly—or at all—into genres. Vergil’s *Georgics*, a poem about everything from arboriculture and bee-keeping to politics and philosophy, is an obvious case in point. Second, the differences *within* genres are often as great as those *between* genres. Although both Vergil and Ovid write within the epic genre, their poetry exhibits vast differences. With the *Aeneid*, Vergil composes a national poem about the origins of the Roman people; with the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid composes a poem about magical change and transformation.

Furthermore, the Genre paradigm runs into difficulties when confronted with the *Aeneid* itself. On the one hand, the *Aeneid* is a traditional epic poem. Like the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the *Aeneid* tells the tale of a hero and his adventures through a combination of narrative and dialogue, and contains such common epic “features” as similes and ekphrases. Yet, on the other hand, the *Aeneid* is more than just a traditional epic. Servius, the 4th Century A.D. Vergilian scholar, maintained that Vergil had another aim in writing the *Aeneid* besides imitating Homer: “*Augustum laudare a parentibus*, to praise Augustus beginning with his ancestors” (*ad. Aen.* 1.pr.). Unlike the Homeric poems, the *Aeneid*, as Servius rightly observed, contains a marked

³⁴ For the different conceptions of “genre” from antiquity to the present, see Manning, Clarence A. and George Nakashidse. “Genres,” *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Alex Preminger, Frank J. Warnke, and O. B. Hardison Jr. editors, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974).

³⁵ Jonathan Culler, *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975) 145.

historical/political dimension. While not a poem directly about Augustus and Rome, the *Aeneid* nevertheless reflects and comments upon both in subtle and complex ways. Moreover, the *Aeneid* contains a philosophical dimension foreign to most epic poetry. In Book 6, for example, Vergil has Anchises describe the nature of souls, a passage that evokes the philosophical works of Plato and Lucretius more than Homer or the other poets of the Epic cycle. Thus, while the *Aeneid* is often viewed as the quintessential Latin epic, Vergil shows little concern for adhering to any strict rules of what an epic should or should not be.

Finally, there is the Allusion paradigm.³⁶ Like the Imitation and Genre paradigms, the Allusion paradigm begins with a recognition of the *Aeneid*'s close connection to the Homeric poems. Unlike the Imitation and Genre paradigms, however, the Allusion paradigm regards this connection not as an end point for discussion, but as a starting point. According to the Allusion paradigm, Vergil models the *Aeneid* on the Homeric poems not because he must, but because he chooses to. More to the point, Vergil models the *Aeneid* on the Homeric poems because he wishes to allude to the Homeric poems, because he wishes to develop his own characters and themes by means of comparison and contrast with the Homeric poems. When seen through the lens of the Allusion paradigm, the shield of Aeneas finally comes into its own. Seen through the lens of the Imitation and Genre paradigms, the shield of Aeneas is unremarkable; it is either an impressive copy (Imitation paradigm) or a requisite epic "feature" (Genre paradigm). Seen through the lens of the Allusion paradigm, however, the shield of Aeneas contributes meaning to the poem. The shield of Aeneas, when seen as an allusion to the shield of Achilles, suggests that Aeneas is in some way "playing" or "assuming" the role of Achilles.³⁷ Naturally, this suggestion raises questions. First, *how* does Aeneas resemble Achilles? Second, and more importantly, *why*

³⁶ For an introduction to the study of allusion in Latin poetry, see Stephen Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

³⁷ Farrell (1997) 225.

does Aeneas resemble Achilles? What, in other words, does Vergil mean by having Aeneas play this Homeric role? Ultimately, the Allusion paradigm, inasmuch as it sees connections between the *Aeneid* and the Homeric poems as textually meaningful and significant, is the most suitable interpretive paradigm for investigating Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12.

Much as the Allusion paradigm is the best interpretive paradigm by which to understand the *Aeneid's* connection to the Homeric poems, so is a methodology based on the Allusion paradigm the best system by which to study Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12. In *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*, Lyne, the scholar whose work on Turnus' role as Diomedes and Aeneas' role as Achilles was considered above, points the way to such a methodology.³⁸ In his chapter on allusion in the *Aeneid*, Lyne lays out a series of principles, or "theses," on Vergilian allusion.³⁹ Three of these principles form the basic building blocks for such a methodology: (1) Vergil helps the reader to perceive his allusions by means of "signals", or, as they will be referred to in this paper, "textual signals" (i.e., textual features of the poem that evoke other texts); (2) An allusion, once perceived, invites the reader to compare and contrast an *Aeneid* character/situation with the source character/situation; (3) This process of comparing and

³⁸ In reality, Lyne never talks about methodology *per se*, but his work suggests and points to the methodology described in the remainder of this section. It should also be acknowledged that Lyne's methodology is not the only one available for studying allusion in the *Aeneid*. In her own way, Katherine King, in "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's *Aeneid*," points the way to a different methodology for studying *Aeneid* allusions. Whereas Lyne's methodology stresses the importance of studying the *Aeneid's* allusions against the works to which the allusions point (i.e., the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, etc.), King's methodology stresses the importance of studying the *Aeneid's* allusions as part of a closed system. Thus, for example, Lyne's methodology would insist on studying Aeneas' role as Achilles by comparing Aeneas to *Homer's* Achilles, i.e., to the Achilles that serves as the model for Aeneas' actions and behavior at certain points; King's methodology, on the other hand, would insist on studying Aeneas' role as Achilles by comparing Aeneas to *Vergil's* Achilles, i.e., to the Achilles that emerges from the narrator's and characters' statements about and references to Achilles in the *Aeneid*.

While both methodologies have merit, this paper will make use of Lyne's methodology. The main reason for this choice is that Lyne's methodology is more versatile than King's. Unlike King's methodology, Lyne's methodology is capable of shedding light not just on primary Homeric roles in the *Aeneid* (e.g., Aeneas-Achilles), but secondary Homeric roles (e.g., Aeneas-Agamemnon). King's methodology depends in no small measure on Vergil's characterizations of Homer's characters. Yet, apart from Achilles, Hector, and perhaps Diomedes, Vergil simply does not provide full portraits of Homer's characters. Thus, it is difficult, if not impossible, to use King's methodology to analyze a secondary Homeric role, such as Aeneas' role as Agamemnon.

³⁹ Lyne (1987) 102-104. Lyne in fact lays out five principles of Vergilian allusion. In reality, however, only the three principles laid out above have a real part to play in Lyne's methodology.

contrasting may thus provoke ideas and suggestions about the *Aeneid* character/situation under consideration. In other words, the methodology that Lyne suggests (but does not explicitly endorse) consists of three steps: Textual Signals, Comparing and Contrasting, and Analyzing. While Lyne's methodology is thus fairly simple and straightforward, the insights to which it can lead make it highly suitable for this investigation.

To illustrate the methodology's potential for this investigation, this section will conclude by presenting the methodology in action. The test-case will be Lyne's investigation of the simile in *Aeneid* 4 in which Vergil compares Aeneas to Apollo.⁴⁰

Step 1: Textual Signals.⁴¹ Lyne begins his investigation of the Aeneas-Apollo simile from *Aeneid* 4 by quoting and translating the passage under consideration:

*quailis ubi hibernam Lyciam Xanthique fluenta
deserit ac Delum maternam invisit Apollo
instauratque choros, mixtique altaria circum
Cretesque Dryopesque fremunt pictique Agathyrsi;
ipse iugis Cynthi graditur mollique fluentem
fronde premit crinem fingens atque implicat auro,
tela sonant umeris...(Aen. 4.143-149)*

As when Apollo abandons Lycia, his winter home, and the streams of Xanthus, and visit his mother's Delos, renewing the dances, and Cretans, Dryopians, and painted Agathyrsians mingle round his altars and raise their voices; he himself ranges the ridges of Cynthus and with soft leafage shapes and confines his flowing hair, and entwines it with gold; his arrows clash on his shoulders...⁴²

As usual, Lyne approaches this passage with an underlying assumption: namely, that the Aeneas-Apollo simile, like most of Vergil's similes, is modeled on a simile from some other work. In order to test this assumption, Lyne probes for "textual signals," or prominent features of the text,

⁴⁰ Throughout the remainder of this section, I take the liberty of fleshing out Lyne's methodological steps. Like many literary scholars, Lyne is more artist than scientist. He is more interested in conveying his ideas and insights than he is in laying out his thought process in a regimented way. Nevertheless, as will be shown, his arguments can easily be broken down into the three step methodology that *Further Voices* indirectly suggests.

⁴¹ Step 1 is often unnecessary. Many times, the allusion is obvious enough that searching for textual signals becomes more of a formality than a necessity. Nevertheless, Step 1 will be used throughout the paper so as to provide a level of regularity and consistency to each of the case studies.

⁴² Lyne (1987) 123.

that suggest a link between the *Aeneid* simile and a simile from some other work. In this particular case, Lyne identifies several textual signals in the *Aeneid* passage: Apollo as the object of comparison, Apollo's visit to his native island, Delos, Apollo's concern for his hair, etc. Having identified these textual signals, Lyne searches for similes from other works that have the same or similar textual signals. What he finds is that a simile from Apollonius' *Argonautica* fits the bill:

οἶος δ' ἐκ νηοῖο θυώδεος εἴσιν Ἀπόλλων
Δῆλον ἀν' ἡγαθέην ἢ Κλάρον, ἢ ὅγε Πυθώ
ἢ Λυκίην εὐρείαν ἐπὶ Ξάνθοιο ῥοῇσι—
τοῖος ἀνὰ πλῆθυν δήμου κίεν...
(*Arg.* 1.307-310)

And just as Apollo goes from his fragrant temple throughout sacred Delos, or Claros, or Delphi, or wide Lycia, near the streams of the Xanthos, so was he [Jason] making his way through the mass of men...⁴³

Thus, Lyne concludes that *Aeneid* 4.143-149 is an allusion to *Argonautica* 1.307-310.

Step 2: Comparing and Contrasting. Having determined that *Aeneid* 4.143-149 is an allusion to *Argonautica* 1.307-310, Lyne sets about comparing and contrasting the two passages. On a basic level, Lyne notes, the function of both the *Aeneid* and the *Argonautica* simile is to highlight the beauty and magnificence of the poem's hero (Aeneas/Jason). Indeed, in the case of the *Argonautica* simile, this seems to be the simile's sole purpose. Lyne writes: "In Apollonius the main function of the simile is to suggest the beauty and splendor of Jason."⁴⁴ In the case of the *Aeneid* simile, however, Lyne believes that there is more going on than first meets the eye. Vergil, Lyne maintains, sets up not just one comparison with his simile, but two. By basing his simile so closely on Apollonius' simile, Vergil expects the reader to perceive not only a

⁴³ Both the quotation and translation are my own. While Lyne says that the *Aeneid* simile is an allusion to this *Argonautica* simile, he does not let the reader see this for himself.

⁴⁴ Lyne (1987) 123.

comparison between Aeneas and Apollo, but between Aeneas and Jason. In other words, Vergil *textually* compares Aeneas to Apollo, but *allusively* compares Aeneas to Jason.

Step 3: Analyzing. Having compared and contrasted the *Aeneid* simile and the *Argonautica* simile, Lyne analyzes what these similarities and differences mean for Aeneas and the *Aeneid* itself. In particular, Lyne analyzes the simile's implicit comparison of Aeneas and Jason. Lyne sees this comparison as inherently troubling: "But of course, if we sense an allusion to Apollonius, there is a disturbing association for our hero: Aeneas as a Jason figure. In what sense? A further voice intrudes a troubling question."⁴⁵ While Lyne does not develop this idea further, this "further voice," this troubling note, can easily be explained. For Vergil to set up Aeneas as a "Jason figure"—to cast Aeneas, in other words, in the role of Jason—is for him to suggest certain things about Aeneas' character. With this implicit comparison, Vergil highlights Aeneas' falseness, coldness, and self-interestedness—his Jason-like qualities. Moreover, with this comparison Vergil foreshadows the unhappy end of Aeneas' love affair with Dido. In other words, while the simile's explicit comparison (Aeneas-Apollo) casts Aeneas in a positive light, the simile's implicit comparison (Aeneas-Jason) casts him in an far more negative light.

Based on this test-case, it should be clear that Lyne's methodology is particularly well-suited to the current investigation. First and foremost, Lyne's methodology manages to explain the connection between two major concepts discussed thus far: Homeric roles and allusions. In essence, as seen through the lens of Lyne's methodology, Vergil uses allusion to establish Homer roles for his characters. For instance, to return to a by now familiar passage, Vergil alludes at the end of *Aeneid* 8 to the Achilles of *Iliad* 18 in order to cast Aeneas in the Homeric role of Achilles. Second, and more generally, Lyne's methodology does what any good methodology

⁴⁵ Ibid. 124.

does: it provides a simple and straightforward system with which to study a given subject. Thus, Lyne's methodology should prove more than sufficient for investigating the meaning and significance of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12.

Chapter 2: Aeneas' Homeric Roles in Book 12

This chapter focuses on Aeneas' Homeric roles in Book 12. Throughout Book 12, as shown above, Aeneas plays the role of a large number of Homeric characters: Achilles, Agamemnon, Menelaus, etc. While the identification of Aeneas' Homeric roles in Book 12 is thus fairly clear, the meaning of these roles is not. The aim of this chapter, therefore, is to address the following questions about Aeneas' Homeric roles in Book 12: Why does Aeneas play the Homeric roles he does in Book 12? What do these Homeric roles reveal about Aeneas and the *Aeneid* itself? In order to address these questions about Aeneas' Homeric roles, this chapter will consider three Homeric roles that Aeneas plays in Book 12: Agamemnon, Hector, and Achilles.

Aeneas as Agamemnon

*tum pius Aeneas stricto sic ense precatur:
'esto nunc Sol testis et haec mihi terra uocanti,
quam propter tantos potui perferre labores,
et pater omnipotens et tu Saturnia coniunx
(iam melior, iam, diua, precor), tuque inclute Mauors,
cuncta tuo qui bella, pater, sub numine torques;
fontisque fluviosque uoco, quaeque aetheris alti
religio et quae caeruleo sunt numina ponto:
cesserit Ausonio si fors uictoria Turno,
conuenit Euandri uictos discedere ad urbem,
cedet Iulus agris, nec post arma ulla rebelles
Aeneadae referent ferroue haec regna lacessent.
sin nostrum adnuerit nobis uictoria Martem
(ut potius reor et potius di numine firment),
non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo
nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambae
inuictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.
sacra deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto,
imperium sollemne socer; mihi moenia Teucrici
constituent urbique dabit Lauinia nomen.'*

(*Aen.* 12.175-194)

Then pious Aeneas, with his sword drawn, prayed as follows: “Let the Sun now be witness to me as I speak and this Earth as well, on whose account I was able to endure so many toils, and you, too, all-powerful father Jupiter; and you, Saturnian Juno, may you now, oh goddess, be gentler now, I beg you; and you as well, illustrious father Mars, you who dispense all wars by your own power; and I call on the Springs and the Rivers, and whatever sanctity of high heaven there is and whatever divinities there are in the green-blue sea. If by chance victory goes to Ausonian Turnus, it is agreed that the defeated will retreat to the city of Evander, and Iulus will withdraw from the fields; nor will the descendents of Aeneas hereafter take up further arms in rebellion or challenge this kingdom with the sword. But if Victory nods in our direction, to our Mars—as I think is more likely, and may the gods confirm it with their will—I will neither force the Italians to obey the Teucrians, nor will I seek out kingdoms for myself; let both peoples, undefeated, commit themselves to everlasting alliance with fair laws for both. I will introduce our sacrifices and our gods; let my father-in-law, Latinus, retain his arms, let my father-in-law retain his dignified rule; the Teucrians will construct walls for me and Lavinia will give her name to the city.”

τοῖσιν δ' Ἀτρείδης μεγάλ' εὔχετο χεῖρας ἀνασχών·
“Ζεῦ πάτερ, Ἰδηθεν μεδέων, κύδιστε μέγιστε,
Ἡελίος θ', ὅς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις,
καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ γαῖα, καὶ οἱ ὑπένερθε καμόντας
ἀνθρώπους τίνυσθον, ὅτις κ' ἐπίορκον ὁμόσση,
ὑμεῖς μάρτυροι ἔστε, φυλάσσετε δ' ὅρκια πιστά·
εἰ μὲν κεν Μενέλαον Ἀλέξανδρος καταπέφνη,
αὐτὸς ἔπειθ' Ἑλένην ἔχέτω καὶ κτήματα πάντα,
ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν νήεσσι νεώμεθα ποντοπόροισιν·
εἰ δέ κ' Ἀλέξανδρον κτείνει ξανθὸς Μενέλαος,
Τρῶας ἔπειθ' Ἑλένην καὶ κτήματα πάντ' ἀποδοῦναι,
τιμὴν δ' Ἀργείοις ἀποτινέμεν ἢ τιν' εἰσέειναι,
ἢ τε καὶ ἔσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται.
εἰ δ' ἂν ἐμοὶ τιμὴν Πρίαμος Πριάμοιο τέ παῖδες
τίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν, Ἀλεξάνδροιο πεσόντος,
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα μαχήσομαι εἵνεκα ποιῆς
αὔθι μένων, ἥος κε τέλος πολέμοιο κιχέω.”
(*Il.* 3.276-291)

And on their behalf the son of Atreus prayed loudly as he lifted up his hands: “Father Zeus, you who rule from Ida, greatest and most glorious, and Sun, you who look upon everything and hear everything, and Rivers and Earth, and those below who punish men who have died, whichever man swears an oath falsely—be you all witnesses, and guard these binding oaths. If Alexander slays Menelaus, then let him retain Helen and all her possessions, and let us return home in our sea-faring ships; but if sandy-haired Menelaus kills Alexander, then the Trojans must return Helen and all her possessions, and must pay the Argives back with a recompense that seems fitting, which will still be around for men to come. But if Priam and Priam’s sons refuse to pay me a recompense when Alexander

has fallen, I will continue to fight for restitution and remain here until I find an end to the war.”

Early in Book 12, Vergil has Aeneas play the secondary Homeric role of Agamemnon. Unlike many of Vergil’s Homeric allusions, the allusion to Agamemnon readily presents itself. In terms of Lyne’s methodology, several “textual signals” confirm the allusion.⁴⁶ First and foremost, the general situation in the *Aeneid* passage closely resembles that in the *Iliad* passage. In *Iliad* 3, Agamemnon and Priam meet to confirm a truce whereby the Greeks and Trojans will cease fighting one another so that Menelaus and Paris may settle the conflict in single combat. Similarly, in *Aeneid* 12, Aeneas and Latinus confirm a truce whereby the Trojans and Latins will cease fighting one another so that Aeneas and Turnus may settle the conflict in single combat. Second, and more specifically, Aeneas’ speech itself closely resembles Agamemnon’s speech. Structurally, both Aeneas’ and Agamemnon’s speeches consist of three parts arranged in the same order: (1) Invocation to the gods and other deities to bear witness to the truce; (2) Consequences if the adverse result occurs (i.e., Aeneas/Menelaus loses); (3) Consequences if the favorable result occurs (i.e., Aeneas/Menelaus wins). Even on the level of content, Aeneas’ speech also somewhat resembles Agamemnon’s speech. Both Aeneas’ and Agamemnon’s invocations, for instance, consist of many of the same deities: Jupiter/J Zeus, Sun, Earth, and the Rivers.⁴⁷

While textual signals thus confirm the existence of a Homeric allusion behind Aeneas’ speech in Book 12, they do not explain the allusion’s meaning and significance. For that, as Lyne acknowledges, interpretation and analysis are required. Unfortunately, in this case, the

⁴⁶ Throughout this case study and the following case studies, Lyne’s methodology will be used. However, the methodology’s three steps will be woven into the fabric of each case study, rather than explicitly stated, as in the Introduction example.

⁴⁷ Gransden (1984) 196.

existing interpretations and analyses have not been entirely satisfactory. In the view of Anderson and Gransden, two of the few scholars to offer explanations, the meaning and significance of Aeneas' role as Agamemnon is simple and straightforward: Vergil has Aeneas play the role of Agamemnon in order to reinforce Aeneas' association with Homer's Greeks rather than Homer's Trojans, in order to foreshadow, in effect, Aeneas' ultimate victory.⁴⁸ While the allusion does indeed work in this way, it works in other more subtle and more suggestive ways as well. With the allusion to Agamemnon at the beginning of Book 12, Vergil highlights both Aeneas' strengths and limitations as a leader.

On one level, Vergil highlights Aeneas' strengths as leader by manipulating the tone and approach of Agamemnon's speech. In *Iliad* 3, Agamemnon delivers a characteristically tactless speech. While the first half of his speech provides some semblance of decorum, the second half brims with greed and insecurity. In describing the consequences of both Menelaus' and Paris' victory, Agamemnon lays down different—and unequal—penalties for the two sides.⁴⁹ If Menelaus loses, Agamemnon pledges that the Greeks will allow the Trojans to retain Helen and all her possessions, and will sail back to Greece; if Paris loses, however, Agamemnon insists that the Trojans must give back not only Helen and all her possessions, but an additional recompense as well.⁵⁰ Agamemnon declares: “τιμὴν δ’ Ἀργείοις ἀποτινέμεν ἢν τιν’ ἔοικεν, // ἣ τε καὶ

⁴⁸ Anderson (1957) 23 and Gransden (1984) 197. As discussed in the Introduction, Anderson argues that Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles—including Aeneas' role as Agamemnon—serve to foreshadow the ultimate victors and losers in Vergil's *Iliad*: “As I shall show, he [Vergil] allows the Italians at first to construct a false pattern of hopes based upon the Trojan War; this pattern ultimately becomes symptomatic of their defeat as Vergil reassigns Homeric roles so as to embody in Aeneas the victorious Achilles, Agamemnon, and Menelaus.” Likewise Gransden: “Virgil's Aeneas... must subsume the roles of Menelaus, rightful suitor, and Agamemnon, commander of the armies of victory...” While this view of Aeneas' role of Agamemnon is not wrong, it is not the whole story, as the rest of this section will show.

⁴⁹ G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: Books 1-4*, G. S. Kirk ed., (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 306. Agamemnon's greed comes through all the more when one realizes that he is the first to suggest an additional recompense. “The idea of compensation is Agamemnon's; nothing has been said about it so far by Paris or Hektor (naturally enough), or even by Menelaos when he responds in general terms to their proposals...”

⁵⁰ While the Greeks may indeed be entitled to a greater recompense given the fact that the Trojans instigated the war, Agamemnon's words suggest that his motive for making this demand is more greed than justice. After all, he

ἔσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται, and [the Trojans] must pay the Argives back with a recompense that seems fitting, which will still be around for men to come" (*Il.* 3.286-287).

Agamemnon's insecurity follows close on the heels of his greed. In the last lines of his speech, Agamemnon declares:

εἰ δ' ἂν ἔμοι τιμὴν Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
τίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν Ἀλεξάνδροιο πεσόντος,
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα μαχήσομαι εἵνεκα ποινῆς
αὔθι μένων, ἥος κε τέλος πολέμοιο κιχέω.
(*Il.* 3.288-291)

But if Priam and Priam's sons refuse to pay me a recompense when Alexander has fallen, I will continue to fight for restitution and remain here until I find an end to the war.

In short, Agamemnon's speech reveals Agamemnon for the domineering, though deeply insecure, leader he is.⁵¹

In *Aeneid* 12, however, Aeneas' speech differs markedly from Agamemnon's in tone and approach. Unlike Agamemnon, Aeneas speaks from first to last with strength and self-assurance. Mid-way through his speech, Aeneas declares matter-of-factly that he expects to win in the duel: "*sin nostrum adnuerit nobis uictoria Martem // (ut potius reor et potius di numine firment)...*, But if victory nods in our direction, to our Mars—as I think is more likely, and may the gods confirm it with their will..." (*Aen.* 12.178-179). Moreover, Aeneas speaks with true graciousness and good will.⁵² First, Aeneas offers a far more reassuring pledge of what the Trojans will do in the event of his defeat than Agamemnon does in the event of Menelaus' defeat. Whereas Agamemnon promises that the Greeks will sail away from Troy—but nothing

speaks of the recompense as "ἥ τε καὶ ἔσσομένοισι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται, [one] which will still be around for men to come" (*Il.* 3.287). In other words, he focuses not on how this additional recompense will satisfy the wrong done, but on how implicitly splendid and lavish this recompense will be.

⁵¹ Kirk (1985) 306.

⁵² Gilbert Highet, *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972) 119 notes the magnanimity of Aeneas' speech as compared to Agamemnon's: "And he [Vergil] wished the concluding agreement in the *Aeneid* to be more magnanimous and far-reaching than that between Agamemnon and Achilles (*Il.* 19.238-275) or the oath of Agamemnon (*Il.* 3.276-291)."

about what they will do thereafter—Aeneas promises that the Trojans will retreat from Latium and never again take up arms against the Latins again. Aeneas says: “*nec post arma ulla rebelles* // *Aeneadae referent ferroue haec regna lacessent*, nor will the descendents of Aeneas hereafter take up further arms in rebellion or challenge this kingdom with the sword” (*Aen.* 12.185-186). Second, and more significantly, when Aeneas describes the consequences if he should win the duel, he strikes a conciliatory, rather than a hostile, note. In the conclusion of his speech, Aeneas impresses upon the Latins that his victory would mean not destruction and enslavement for them, but joint-rule and equality with the Trojans:

*non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo
nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambae
inuictae gentes aeterna in foedera mittant.
sacra deosque dabo; socer arma Latinus habeto,
imperium sollemne socer; mihi moenia Teucri
constituent urbique dabit Lavinia nomen.*⁵³

I will neither force the Italians to obey the Teucrians, nor will I seek out kingdoms for myself; let both peoples, undefeated, commit themselves to everlasting alliance with fair laws for both. I will introduce our sacrifices and our gods; let my father-in-law, Latinus, retain his arms, let my father-in-law retain his dignified rule; the Teucrians will construct walls for me and Lavinia will give her name to the city.

Thus, unlike Agamemnon, Aeneas displays not insecurity and greed, but confidence and magnanimity. In short, the allusion to Agamemnon highlights by way of contrast Aeneas’ great strength as a leader: his *pietas*, his sense of duty, faith, and compassion.⁵³

However, on another level, Vergil uses the allusion to Agamemnon to highlight Aeneas’ limitations as a leader, too. In *Iliad* 3, Agamemnon agrees to a duel between Menelaus and Paris

⁵³ Aeneas’ *pietas* has been variously understood and interpreted. On one extreme, Nicolas Moseley, in “Pius Aeneas,” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 7 (Apr., 1925), argues that Aeneas’ *pietas* is strictly religious; on the other extreme, James Henry, in *Aeneidea: Volume I*, (New York: Lenox Hill Publishers, 1972) 175-187, argues that Aeneas’ *pietas* is not religious, but instead a sort of philanthropic, humanitarian love and good will. The reality, however, is that Aeneas’ *pietas* is not just religious and not just humanitarian. Based on textual instances of the term, Aeneas’ *pietas* connotes a range of virtues, including, at different times, religious devotion (cf. *Aen.* 7.5-7), national duty (cf. *Aen.* 4.393-396), and personal compassion (cf. *Aen.* 10.825-826).

in the expectation that it will provide a long-overdue resolution to the war. Yet, as events turn out, his hopes prove ill-founded. Not only does the duel end inconclusively, but the Trojan warrior Pandarus, at the instigation of Athena, reignites the fighting by shooting Menelaus with an arrow. Thus, despite his solemn pledge and lofty rhetoric, Agamemnon is ultimately rendered powerless by gods who have other plans for him and his people. In *Aeneid* 12, the same mortal-immortal power dynamics are at work. After confirming the truce with Latinus, Aeneas must watch as Juno and her pawn, Juturna, prevent the duel from taking place and violate the truce itself. However, whereas in the *Iliad* Agamemnon's powerlessness in the face of divinity has a semi-comical, or at least not wholly serious, quality about it, Aeneas' powerlessness in the face of divinity is anything but comical; his powerlessness is disturbing—even sinister. After all, in confirming the treaty with Latinus, Aeneas calls upon all the strength—all the *pietas*—he possesses. When he prays to Juno, for instance, he speaks with a desperate earnestness: “*et tu Saturnia coniunx, // (iam melior, iam, diua, precor)...*, and you, Saturnian Juno, may you now, oh goddess, be gentler now, I beg you...” (*Aen.* 12.178-179). And yet, in the end, it is not enough. With consummate ease Juno and Juturna destroy everything Aeneas has just worked to achieve. Thus, the allusion to Agamemnon points to the fundamental limitations of Aeneas as leader—the fundamental limitations of his *pietas*—and to the fundamental power of Juno.⁵⁴

Furthermore, if the allusion to Agamemnon points to Aeneas' powerlessness in the face of divinity, it also, by extension, points to Aeneas' ignorance of his powerlessness.⁵⁵ In his

⁵⁴ W. R. Johnson, “Aeneas and the Ironies of *Pietas*,” *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 60, No. 8 (May, 1965) 360. Johnson in fact sees the limitations, and, in some sense, failure of Aeneas' *pietas* as constituting the basis of Aeneas' tragedy: “But Aeneas' tragedy is precisely this: he is a sensitive, compassionate man who is called upon to act in a world where sensitivity and compassion are beside the point; he is a man ruthlessly schooled in self-control who is hurled into *discordia* and *ira*, whose destiny is achieved not through mercy but through anger. It is in the utter failure of his *pietas* that Aeneas becomes a tragic hero.”

⁵⁵ Like *pietas*, “ignorance” or “unknowingness” is an integral part of Aeneas' character. The narrator describes Aeneas as *ignarus*, *inscius*, and *nescius*—all synonyms for “ignorant,” “unknowing,” or “unaware”—five times,

speech in *Iliad* 3, Agamemnon makes a point of invoking the Furies, the divinities who punish men who break their oaths: “καὶ οἱ ὑπένερθε καμόντας // ἀνθρώπους τίνυσθον, ὅτις κ’ ἐπίορκον ὁμόςσῃ, and those below who punish men who have died, whichever man swears an oath falsely” (*Il.* 3.278-279).⁵⁶ By invoking the Furies, Agamemnon hedges his bets; he realizes, on some level, that the truce may be broken, and therefore calls to witness those agents who can help him in that eventuality. In *Aeneid* 12, however, Aeneas makes no mention of the Furies.⁵⁷ In Aeneas’ mind, it seems, the Furies do not need to be invoked; there is no question that the duel will take place, that the oaths will be kept, that fair play, in short, will be observed. On one level, Aeneas’ expectations regarding the truce highlight his confidence and strength; on another level, however, his expectations point to something more troubling and disturbing. While Aeneas may be striving to build a world characterized by “fair play,” a world characterized by *pietas*, that world, even at poem’s end, remains centuries away.⁵⁸ In implicitly assuming that he is living in that world, however, Aeneas exhibits no small degree of ignorance, no small degree of naïveté.

three times directly (*Aen.* 6.711, 8.730, 10.249-250), two times indirectly through similes (*Aen.* 2.307, 4.72). Two characters describe Aeneas likewise: Helenus (*Aen.* 3.381-382) and Venus (*Aen.* 10.25).

⁵⁶ The agents that Agamemnon invokes are not Ἐρινύες, Erinyes/Furies, as might be expected, but simply: “οἱ ὑπένερθε καμόντας // ἀνθρώπους τίνυσθον...”, those below who punish men who have died,” (*Il.* 3.278-279). Consequently, some scholars have argued that these agents are not the Erinyes/Furies, but Hades and Persephone. However, as Kirk (1985) 305 argues, the roughly similar oath scene in *Iliad* 19 supports the view that the οἱ ὑπένερθε are indeed to be identified with the Erinyes/Furies. In his speech to Achilles in which he promises that he never laid hands on Briseis, Agamemnon says: “ἴστω νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα, θεῶν ὑπατος καὶ ἄριστος, // Γῆ τε καὶ Ἥλιος καὶ Ἐρινύες, αἱ θ’ ὑπὸ γαίαν // ἀνθρώπους τίνυνται, ὅτις κ’ ἐπίορκον ὁμόςσῃ...”, Now know Zeus, you who are highest and greatest of the gods, and Earth and Sun and Erinyes, you who punish men beneath the earth, whoever swears falsely...” (*Il.* 19.258-260).

⁵⁷ While both Froma Zeitlin, in “An Analysis of *Aeneid*, XII, 176-211: The Difference Between the Oaths of Aeneas and Latinus,” *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 86, No. 4 (Oct., 1965) 353, and Joseph Fontenrose, in “Apollo and Sol in the Oaths of Aeneas and Latinus,” *Classical Philology*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (Apr., 1943) 138, note Aeneas’ failure to invoke the Furies—or, as they interpret Agamemnon’s οἱ ὑπένερθεν, the gods of the lower world—neither offers an explanation of why Aeneas fails to invoke these deities.

⁵⁸ L. A. MacKay, “Hero and Theme in the *Aeneid*,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 94, (1963) 164. MacKay writes to the same effect, but overstates the case: “Aeneas is creating the world by which he is to be judged, in a universe at times favorable, at times unfavorable, at times indifferent, and there is no sure way that he can calculate which response to expect. He belongs to the world of Sartre and Camus, more than to the world of Demodocus and Phemius.” While Aeneas’ world may be dark—even evil—it is not without morality and not without meaning. It is not, in short, the world of Sartre and Camus.

This same naïveté and ignorance emerges at one other point in Aeneas' speech, too. In his speech, Agamemnon invokes several divinities, including Zeus, Sun, Earth, and, as noted above, the Furies. Notably absent from Agamemnon's invocation, however, are gods whom the king knows to be hostile to the Greek cause⁵⁹; Apollo, Artemis, Ares, and Aphrodite receive no mention in his speech. In *Aeneid* 12, however, Aeneas, as noted above, prays to Juno, his most inveterate enemy in the poem: "*et tu Saturnia coniunx, // (iam melior, iam, diua, precor)...*, and you, Saturnian Juno, may you now, oh goddess, be gentler now, I beg you" (*Aen.* 12.178-179). While this prayer may be interpreted simply as proper religious form⁶⁰—as a further example of Aeneas' *pietas*—it may be interpreted as evidence of Aeneas' ignorance and naïveté, too. Throughout the poem, Aeneas has to contend with the hostility of Juno. In Book 1, Juno convinces Aeolus to rouse a storm against Aeneas' fleet; in Book 7, she summons the Fury, Allecto, to rouse the Latins to war with the Trojans; and, in Book 12, she ultimately incites Juturna to break the truce and rekindle the fighting between the Trojans and Latins. In short, from beginning to end, Juno not only remains fiercely hostile to Aeneas and his mission, but makes no secret of her hostility. Yet, despite such clear and repeated proofs of Juno's hostility, Aeneas clings to the hope that he can somehow placate the queen of the gods, somehow win her over to his cause. In this hope, however, Aeneas is less pious than he is foolish. Aeneas has

⁵⁹ While Zeus sends the false dream to Agamemnon at the beginning of *Iliad* 2, Agamemnon is unaware of this fact. Moreover, according to Zeitlin (1965) 339, Zeus/Jupiter was a common god to invoke in oaths in any case.

⁶⁰ Admittedly, Aeneas' prayer to Juno is not without reason. In Book 3, the seer Helenus instructs Aeneas to pray to Juno in order to placate her: "*Iunonis magnae primum prece numen adora, // Iononi cane uota libens dominamque potentem // supplicibus supera donis...*, implore the divine power of great Juno first with prayer, gladly chant your vows to Juno, and overcome the powerful lady with suppliant gifts" (*Aen.* 3.437-439). Moreover, Karl Galinsky, in "Aeneas' Invocation of Sol, (*Aeneid*, XII, 176)," *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 90, No. 4 (Oct., 1969) 457, maintains that it was customary to invoke hostile divinities in oaths: "It was customary in oaths to invoke the gods whose baneful influence one had the most reason to fear or whom, at any rate, one wanted to propitiate." Still, instructed or not, customary or not, Aeneas' prayer to a goddess who has repeatedly and consistently demonstrated the utmost hostility to him necessarily reflects a degree of ignorance, a degree of naïveté.

every reason to believe that propitiating Juno is a fool's errand, but he does not. In this way, he remains troublingly *ignarus*, "ignorant," and *inscius*, "unknowing."

In conclusion, Vergil's allusion to Agamemnon at the beginning of Book 12 highlights the complex strengths and limitations of Aeneas as leader. On one level, the allusion showcases Aeneas as the confident and capable leader of the future Roman people. Unlike Agamemnon, Aeneas shows in his speech not only strength and self-assuredness, but magnanimity and good will. He shows himself, in essence, to be the embodiment of *pietas*, the embodiment of Anchises' famous formulation of what it means to be Roman: "*parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*, spare the conquered and war down the proud" (*Aen.* 6.853). On another level, however, Vergil uses the allusion to suggest more troubling things about Aeneas as leader. In different ways, the allusion to Agamemnon highlights not only Aeneas' limitations as leader, but Aeneas' own ignorance of these limitations. Aeneas enters Book 12 confident that his leadership and might in arms will see the Trojans through to victory. Like Agamemnon, however, Aeneas fails to reckon with the forces of Olympus. Not only is Aeneas rendered next to powerless by Juno; he fundamentally fails to realize the extent of his powerlessness. Aeneas may be a good—even a great—leader by mortal standards, but this status, the allusion to Agamemnon suggests, means little against the demonic power of Juno.

Aeneas as Hector:

*postquam habilis lateri clipeus loricaque tergo est,
Ascanium fuis circum complectitur armis
summaque per galeam delibans oscula fatur:
'disce, puer, uirtutem ex me uerumque laborem,
fortunam ex aliis. Nunc te mea dextera bello
defensum dabit et magna inter praemia ducet.
tu facito, mox cum matura adoleuerit aetas,
sis memor et te animo repetentem exempla tuorum*

et pater Aeneas et auunculus excitet Hector.
(*Aeneid* 12.432-440)

After the shield was fastened to his side and the breastplate to his back, he [Aeneas] embraced Ascanius, with his arms and armor encircling him, and, as he planted kisses on him through his helmet, said: “my son, learn virtue and true work from me, fortune from others. Now my right hand will keep you safe from war and will lead you among great rewards. See to it that, when you soon become a man, you remember, and that both father Aeneas and your uncle Hector spur you on as you recall in your mind the examples of your kin.”

“Ὡς εἰπὼν οὗ παιδὸς ὄρεξατο φαίδιμος” Ἑκτωρ·
ἄψ δ’ ὁ πάϊς πρὸς κόλπον εὐζώνοιο τιθήνης
ἐκλίνθη ἰάχων, πατρός φίλου ὅψιν ἀτυχθεῖς,
ταρβήσας χαλκὸν τε ἶδε λόφον ἵππιοχαίτην,
δεινὸν ἀπ’ ἀκροτάτης κόρυθος νεύοντα νοήσας.
ἐκ δὲ γέλασσε πατήρ τε φίλος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ·
αὐτίκ’ ἀπὸ κρατὸς κόρυθ’ εἴλετο φαίδιμος” Ἑκτωρ,
καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ παμφανόωσαν·
αὐτὰρ ὁ γ’ ὄν φίλον υἱὸν ἐπεὶ κύσε πῆλὲ τε χερσίν,
εἶπε δ’ ἐπευξάμενος Δίι τ’ ἄλλοισίν τε θεοῖσι·
“Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοί, δότε δὴ καὶ τόνδε γενέσθαι
παῖδ’ ἐμὸν, ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ περ, ἀριπρεπέα Τρώεσσιν,
ὥδε βίην τ’ ἀγαθόν, καὶ Ἰλίου ἱφὶ ἀνάσσειν·
καὶ ποτὲ τις εἴποι ‘πατρός γ’ ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων’
ἐκ πολέμου ἀνιόντα· φέροι δ’ ἔναρα βροτόεντα
κτείνας δῆϊον ἄνδρα, χαρεῖη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ.”
(*Iliad* 6.466-481)

Having spoken thus glorious Hector lifted up his child. But the child recoiled back towards the breast of his deep-girdled nurse, crying, startled by the sight of his dear father, and frightened by the bronze and the horse-hair crest that he noticed nodding terribly from the top of the helmet. And his father and lady mother laughed aloud; straightaway glorious Hector removed the helmet from his head and placed it down upon the ground, gleaming. But when he had kissed his child and tossed him in his hands, he spoke, praying to Zeus and the other gods: “Zeus and you other gods, grant indeed that he, my son, may become preeminent among the Trojans, as indeed I am, and that, in this way, he be noble in his strength, and rule Ilium with might. And, someday, may some man say of him as he returns from battle, ‘he is a better man by far than his father’; and may he carry off bloody spoils after he has killed his foe, and may his mother rejoice in her heart.”

In the middle of Book 12, Vergil presents Aeneas in yet another, secondary Homeric role: Hector. While some scholars have argued that this scene showcases Aeneas in the role of the

Sophoclean Ajax,⁶¹ Vergil's textual signals support a Homeric, as well as a Sophoclean, allusion at work in Aeneas' speech. First and foremost, the general situation in the *Aeneid* passage resembles that in the *Iliad* passage. In *Iliad* 6, Hector returns to Troy and visits his wife, Andromache, and infant son, Astyanax. There, before returning to battle, Hector delivers a speech to his son. Similarly, in *Aeneid* 12, Aeneas returns to the Trojan camp, and, before reentering the battle, delivers a speech to his son, Ascanius.⁶² Second, Aeneas' speech to Ascanius, like Hector's speech to Astyanax, is his first and only speech to his son in the entire poem.⁶³ Third, Aeneas' mention of "*auunculus...Hector*, uncle Hector" (*Aen.* 12.440), naturally cues the reader to be thinking of Hector, naturally paves the way, in effect, for an allusion to Hector.

While these textual signals support the existence of an allusion to Hector at work in Aeneas' speech to Ascanius, they do not, as usual, disclose the allusion's meaning. Instead, they point to the need for further analysis and interpretation. Like Aeneas' role as Agamemnon, Aeneas' role as Hector has received scanty attention. The primary proponent of Aeneas' role as Hector is Spaeth, and his view of this Homeric role, as discussed in the Introduction, leaves much to be desired. While Spaeth focuses primarily on establishing Aeneas' role as Hector, he does in fact offer up an interpretation—limited though it may be—of what this Homeric role means. In Spaeth's view, Vergil has Aeneas play the role of Hector so that the former may be

⁶¹ For the Sophoclean allusion at work in Aeneas' speech to Ascanius, see Lyne (1987) 8-12. Lyne argues that Aeneas' speech to Ascanius alludes not so much to Hector's speech to his son in the *Iliad* as to Ajax's speech to his son in Sophocles' eponymous play. "For the moment it suffices to say that at this point in the narrative Aeneas is being represented, at a certain level, as playing the role of the tragic Ajax. And this is significant, and disturbing. As Aeneas re-enters the battle, presented by the epic voice as a hero bent on establishing peace and the common good, we have the troubling, allusive suggestion of something quite different: a relentless, passionate hero, whose essentially selfish obsession with honour led to madness and suicide." While Lyne is certainly right to see the Sophoclean allusion at work in Aeneas' speech, the Homeric allusion, as the rest of this section will show, is equally prominent—and equally troubling.

⁶² R. D. Williams, *Virgil: Aeneid VII-XII*, (London: Bristol Classical Press) 466.

⁶³ Lyne (1987) 152.

seen to redeem the death and defeat of the latter. The problem with this view, however, is that it does nothing to explain Aeneas' role as Hector midway through Book 12; Aeneas' speech to Ascanius, after all, has little—if anything—to do with Aeneas' ultimate victory. Fortunately, in *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*, Lyne points the way towards a more sensible interpretation of Aeneas' role as Hector. In discussing Aeneas' speech to Ascanius in Book 12, Lyne notes Aeneas' general coldness and aloofness. Unlike Hector, Lyne observes, Aeneas stands unaffected and unmoved by what may be his final interaction with his son. In this view, Lyne hits the mark. Indeed, with the allusion to Hector in Aeneas' speech to Ascanius, Vergil highlights Aeneas' emotional limitedness, and, more specifically, his shortcomings as a father.

First, Vergil begins to hint at Aeneas' emotional limitedness with his exclusion of the laughter found in the *Iliad* passage. In *Iliad* 6, Hector returns to Troy and visits his family for what may be—and indeed turns out to be—the last time. Yet, despite the precariousness and uncertainty of his situation, Hector exhibits not only clear-eyed confidence, but a sense of humor as well. When Astyanax begins to cry at the sight of his father's helmet crest, Hector laughs: “ἐκ δὲ γέλασσε πατήρ τε φίλος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ, and his father and lady mother laughed aloud” (*Il.* 6.471). As difficult—even terrible—as his situation is, Hector shows with this simple laugh that he has not lost his sense of humor, his sense of joy, his sense, in other words, of what is good in the world. In the *Aeneid* passage, however, Aeneas exhibits no such laughter. While Vergil admittedly includes no corresponding prompt for Aeneas' laughter, there is a good reason for this exclusion: Aeneas never has laughed and, likely, never will laugh. Throughout this scene, as throughout the poem as a whole, Aeneas is dour, austere, and taciturn.⁶⁴ Whereas Hector is able

⁶⁴ For these aspects of Aeneas' character, see Dennis Feeney, “The Taciturnity of Aeneas,” *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 33, No. 1 (1983) 210-219, and Lyne (1987) 179-183. Feeney, on the whole, views Aeneas' taciturnity as a source of strength for Aeneas: his taciturnity is “a restrained disavowal of the fervor which animates the language of the other characters when they seek to influence their listeners.” Aeneas' taciturnity, in other words,

to laugh—to remain, in some sense, fully human—in spite of his awesome and terrifying duty, Aeneas is not. In the face his own monumental mission, Aeneas finds it within himself to press on only by sacrificing laughter, sacrificing joy, sacrificing, in short, a part of his very humanity.

Second, Vergil points to Aeneas' emotional limitedness by manipulating the role of the helmet in the *Aeneid* passage. In the *Iliad* passage, Hector's helmet illustrates something fundamental about Hector. When young Astyanax sees the fearsome crest of his father's helmet, he begins to cry. Thereupon, Hector does what any good father would do: “αὐτίκ' ἀπὸ κρατὸς κόρυθ' εἴλετο φαίδιμος” Εκτωρ, // καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ παμφανόωσαν..., straightaway glorious Hector removed the helmet from his head and placed it down upon the ground, gleaming...” (*Il.* 6.473-474). With characteristic elegance, Homer thus symbolically captures the dynamics of the situation: Hector the warrior becomes Hector the father.⁶⁵ By laying aside his helmet, Hector shows that he can straddle both the warrior world of duty and honor and the domestic world of joy and tenderness. In the *Aeneid* passage, while the helmet remains an integral part of the scene, it nevertheless suggests something quite different about Aeneas. Revealingly, Aeneas dons his helmet—and all the rest of his armor as well—before addressing Ascanius: “*postquam habilis lateri clipeus loricaque tergo est, // Ascanium fusis circum complectitur armis...*, After his shield had been fastened to his side and his breastplate to his back, he [Aeneas] embraced his son, with his arms and armor encircling him...” (*Aen.* 12.432-433). The tenderness of Hector's interaction with his son is gone; Aeneas gives his son not a

is an expression of his *ratio*, his rationality and reason. Lyne, on the other hand, sees Aeneas' taciturnity in part as a lamentable result of Aeneas' own emotional limitedness.

⁶⁵ For Homeric symbolism, see Jasper Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980) 1-49.

warm embrace, but an iron embrace.⁶⁶ Moreover, when Aeneas kisses his son, he does so through the iron mouthpiece of his helmet: “*summaque per galeam delibans oscula...*, and planting kisses on him through his helmet...” (*Aen.* 12.434). Here, in effect, Aeneas kisses Ascanius not so much as his father, but as his guardian, commander, and ruler. Whereas Hector shows an ability to move adeptly between his role as warrior and his role as father/husband, Aeneas shows no such ability. Thus, even with his son, the person with whom the reader would expect him to be closest, Aeneas remains literally and figuratively encased in his own armor—his own isolating world of *pietas*.⁶⁷

Third, Vergil highlights Aeneas’ emotional limitedness by significantly altering Hector’s speech to his son. In *Iliad* 6, Hector’s speech to his son is a speech of sincere and affectionate hope for his son’s future. Hector begins his speech with a request to the gods to allow his son to become a great warrior and a mighty ruler:

“Ζεῦ ἄλλοι τε θεοί, δότε δὴ καὶ τόνδε γενέσθαι
παῖδ’ ἐμόν, ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ περ, ἄριπρεπέα Τρώεσσιν,
ὧδε βίην τ’ ἀγαθόν, καὶ Ἰλίου ἱφὶ ἀνάσσειν...” (*Il.* 6.476-478)

“Zeus and you other gods, grant indeed that he, my son, may become preeminent among the Trojans, as indeed I am, and that, in this way, he be noble in his strength, and rule Ilium with might...”

Hector then continues with a string of three more wishes: “καὶ ποτέ τις εἴποι ‘πατρός γ’ ὅδε πολλὸν ἀμείνων...,’ And may someone someday say ‘he [Astyanax] was a much better man than his father...’” (*Il.* 6.479); “φέρει δ’ ἔναρα βροτόεντα // κτείνας δῆϊον ἄνδρα..., and may he bear away bloody spoils after having killed his foe” (*Il.* 6.480-481); “χαρεῖη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ..., and may his mother rejoice in her heart [at his deeds]...” (*Il.* 6.481). In effect, these various wishes

⁶⁶ Lyne (1987) 153 writes to a similar effect, but with a touch of humor added for good measure: “What a touch, what an embrace! The one and only time that Aeneas embraces his son it is in armour, and the kiss is through the iron of his helmet.”

⁶⁷ For Aeneas’ relationship with Ascanius in general, see Lyne (1987) 151-155, 189-193.

serve to highlight not just Hector's hopes for his son, but his love and affection for him. In Aeneas' speech, however, such clear love and affection are noticeably lacking. Whereas Hector's speech is filled with wishes for his son, Aeneas' speech is filled with commands. Aeneas begins his speech with a harsh imperative: "*disce, puer, uirtutem ex me uerumque laborem // fortunam ex aliis...*, learn, my son, virtue and true labor from me, fortune from others..." (*Aen.* 12.435-436). He then continues with the still harsher "*tu facito...*, make it so/see to it that..." (*Aen.* 12.438)⁶⁸—an imperative form of the verb *facio* usually reserved for legal documents and courtroom settings. While it may be tempting to attribute Aeneas' harshness in tone and substance to Ascanius' being older than Astyanax and/or to Roman sensibility,⁶⁹ there is a more obvious reason for it. Based on this speech—and the *Aeneid* as a whole—Aeneas simply does not have a warm, affective relationship with his son in the way that Hector does with his. Aeneas plays the part of the stern and austere father throughout the poem, and he, not surprisingly, plays the same part in his speech to Ascanius in Book 12. However, this is not to imply that Aeneas does not love his son; Aeneas loves Ascanius as much as any emotionally limited person loves his son. This is simply to say that "love" to Aeneas means something different than it means to Hector.

⁶⁸ Aeneas' full *tu facito* command highlights his emotional limitedness in another interesting way. Aeneas says: "*tu facito, mox cum matura adoleuerit aetas, // sis memor et te animo repetentem exempla tuorum // et pater Aeneas et auunculus excitet Hector*, See to it that, when you soon become a man, you remember, and that both father Aeneas and your uncle Hector spur you on as you recall in your mind the examples of your kin" (*Aen.* 12.438-440). As shown in this command, Aeneas views himself and Hector as true equals, as being on a par. In Aeneas' eyes, both he and Hector are warriors plain and simple, straightforward models of *uirtus* and *uerus labor*. While Aeneas is right about himself, he is wrong about Hector. Aeneas fails to realize that Hector is not just a warrior, not just a model of *uirtus* and *uerus labor*; Hector is also, as discussed above, a man of duty and a man of laughter, a model warrior and a model father/husband. In short, Aeneas' failure to see this greater depth in Hector is an ironic case of projection: Aeneas reduces Hector to the emotionally limited person he himself is.

⁶⁹ For a brief survey of Greco-Roman father-son relationships, see Lyne (1987) 151-152. Based on the surviving literary evidence, Lyne concludes that father-son relationships did not have to be—and were not as a rule—devoid of affection and tender feelings. "These examples suggest that there was nothing unepic nor unRoman about fathers exhibiting interest in and concern for their sons—on the contrary. And Vergil himself confirms this to be true. Consider Mezentius and Lausus in Book 10, Evander and Pallas in Books 8 and 11."

In conclusion, Vergil has Aeneas play the role of Hector in Book 12 in order to suggest the limitedness of Aeneas' character and, in some sense, the tragedy of that limitedness. Throughout the poem, Vergil depicts Aeneas' greatest strength as his *pietas*. Thanks to this strength, Aeneas manages not only to endure his many hardships, but to prevail in the end. Yet, like all strengths, Aeneas' *pietas* comes at a price. In Aeneas' case, his *pietas* comes at the price of his own humanity; his very *pietas* entails an isolation, a coldness, an aloofness. While Aeneas himself cannot see or understand this darker side to his own greatest strength, the reader, with the help of Vergil's allusion to Hector, can. Like Aeneas, Hector knows what duty and responsibility mean; these values are, in many ways, what Hector dies for in the end. But, unlike Aeneas, Hector knows what joy, laughter, and true love are, too. Hector, in other words, knows that there is more to life than *pietas*. In fact, it is these other parts to life that make *pietas* endurable. However, as the Hector allusion makes painfully clear, Aeneas does not and cannot understand this fact. In the final analysis, Aeneas, for all of his worldly success, is an emotionally hollow, emotionally destitute, person.

Aeneas as Achilles

*stetit acer in armis
Aeneas uoluens oculos dextramque repressit;
et iam iamque magis cunctantem flectere sermo
coeperat, infelix umero cum apparuit alto
balteus et notis fulserunt cingula bullis
Pallantis pueri, uictum quem uulnere Turnus
strauerat atque umeris inimicum insigne gerebat.
ille, oculis postquam saeui monimenta doloris
exuiasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira
terribilis: 'tunc hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc uulnere, Pallas
immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit.'
(Aen. 12.938-949)*

...Aeneas stood, fierce in his arms, whirling his eyes around, and he checked his hand. And now more and more his [Turnus'] speech began to sway him as he delayed, when the sad baldric appeared on his tall shoulder and the young Pallas' belt flashed with its familiar studs, the boy whom, when overcome by his wound, Turnus had slain and whose belt Turnus wore upon his shoulders as a hateful trophy. After he drank in with his eyes the memorials and spoils of his savage pain, he spoke terribly, inflamed with rage and terrible in his anger: "Will you, clothed in the spoils of my own, slip away from me here? Pallas sacrifices you with this wound, Pallas exacts punishment from your criminal blood."

τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πόδας ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς·
"μή με, κύον, γούνων γουνάζεο μηδὲ τοκήων·
αἱ γάρ πῶς αὐτόν με μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἀνείη
ὥμ' ἀποταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἷα ἔοργας,
ὥς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅς σῆς γε κύνας κεφαλῆς ἀπαλάλκοι,
οὐδ' εἴ κεν δεκάκις τε καὶ εἰκοσινήριτ' ἄποινα
στήσωσ' ἐνθαδ' ἄγοντες, ὑπόσχωνται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα,
οὐδ' εἴ κεν σ' αὐτὸν χρυσῷ ἐρύσασθαι ἀνώγοι
Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος· οὐδ' ὥς σέ γε πότνια μήτηρ
ἐνθεμένη λεχέεσσι γοήσεται, ὃν τέκεν αὐτή,
ἀλλὰ κύνες τε καὶ οἰωνοὶ κατὰ πάντα δάσονται."
(*Il.* 22.344-354)

And, looking at him fiercely, swift-footed Achilles spoke: "Do not beg me, dog, by my knees and parents. If only somehow my strength and spirit would allow me myself to rend and eat your flesh raw, such things as you have done, since there is no one who could ward the dogs off from your head, not even if they bring here and set up a ten-fold and twenty-fold ransom, and promise yet more beside, not even if Dardanian Priam should command that you yourself be weighed out in gold. Nor will your lady mother weep for you, stretched out over your bier, you whom she herself bore, but the dogs and birds will devour you up entirely."

In the climax of Book 12, Vergil presents Aeneas in his primary Homeric role: Achilles. Unlike Aeneas' Homeric roles considered above, his role as Achilles is not limited to a single scene or passage. Instead, for roughly the last third of Book 12—from the beginning of Aeneas' duel with Turnus to his ultimate slaying of Turnus—Aeneas plays the role of Homer's greatest hero. For this reason, an investigation of Aeneas' role as Achilles in Book 12 may begin at any number of points. However, a natural passage for investigation—and the passage that will be considered here—is Aeneas' response to Turnus' supplication at the very end of Book 12. In

this passage, Aeneas makes what is not only the most fateful decision of the book, but the most fateful decision of the poem. Therefore, this passage promises to reveal much about not just Aeneas, but about the *Aeneid* itself.

Like the *Aeneid* passages considered above, Aeneas' response to Turnus' supplication contains several textual signals that confirm the Achilles allusion at work in Aeneas' speech. First and foremost, Aeneas' situation at this stage in the poem greatly resembles Achilles' situation midway through *Iliad* 22. In *Iliad* 22, Achilles confronts Hector, the killer of his best friend Patroclus, and mortally wounds him. Hector then delivers a speech of supplication, and Achilles a response to it. Similarly, in the last third of the poem, Aeneas confronts Turnus, the killer of his ward Pallas, and wounds him. Turnus then delivers a speech of supplication, and Aeneas a response to it. Second, Vergil's description of Aeneas in the wake of Turnus' supplication somewhat resembles Homer's description of Achilles in the wake of Hector's supplication. Vergil describes Aeneas as "*acer in armis*, fierce in his arms" (*Aen.* 12.938); Homer describes Achilles as "Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν, looking at him [Hector] fiercely/grimly" (*Il.* 22.344). Third, the tone of Aeneas' speech echoes the tone of Achilles' speech. Like Achilles, Aeneas responds to Turnus' supplication with a combination of rage, passion, and pitilessness. Vergil describes Aeneas as he gives his speech as "*furiis accensus et ira // terribilis...*, inflamed with rage and terrible in his anger... (*Aen.* 12. 947-946). Achilles' speech positively radiates these three qualities: "“μή με, κύον, γούνων γουνάζω μηδε τοκήων, Do not beg me, dog, by my knees and parents” (*Il.* 22.345).

While textual signals thus confirm an allusion to Achilles in Aeneas' final speech, they do not provide an explanation of the meaning and significance of this allusion. As usual, they simply indicate that further investigation is required. In comparison with Aeneas' Homeric roles

considered above, his role as Achilles has received a fair amount of scholarly attention.

However, as discussed in the Introduction, the scholarship on the subject has tended to provide less than satisfactory interpretations and explanations. Anderson, for instance, maintains that Aeneas plays the role of Achilles simply so that he may be seen to assume the mantle of Homer's Greeks, simply so that Vergil can foreshadow his hero's ultimate victory⁷⁰; MacKay, for his part, maintains that Vergil has Aeneas play the role of Achilles to emphasize Aeneas' single-minded obsession with his mission and consequent joyless existence.⁷¹ While Anderson and MacKay are not entirely wrong in their views of what Aeneas' role as Achilles means, they are not entirely right either. In reality, as both Lyne and King have recognized, Aeneas' role as Achilles has deeper and darker levels of meaning and resonance than Anderson, MacKay, and others have realized. Indeed, in Aeneas' response to Turnus' supplication, these deeper and darker levels of meaning and resonance come readily to the fore. With the allusion to Achilles at the end of Book 12, Vergil simultaneously highlights Aeneas' high ideals—his *pietas* and *ratio*—and their ultimate failure and perversion.

Initially, Vergil highlights Aeneas' *pietas* and *ratio* by manipulating the prelude to Achilles' response to Hector's supplication. In *Iliad* 22, Homer has Achilles deal Hector his mortal blow before Hector's supplication and Achilles' response. In this way, Hector's and Achilles' speeches become something of a formality. The momentous decision has already been reached (i.e., Hector will die), and all that remains for Hector and Achilles to discuss is what Achilles will do with Hector's body. In the *Aeneid*, however, Vergil reverses the order of wound and speeches. Rather than having Aeneas deal Turnus his mortal blow *before* Turnus'

⁷⁰ Anderson (1957) 23. It is worth remembering that Anderson believes Aeneas' role as Agamemnon has the same function: Aeneas' role as Agamemnon, like his role as Achilles, suggests that Aeneas is on the side of victory and righteousness. That Anderson would see both Aeneas' role as Agamemnon and Achilles as having the same function should be cause for suspicion, if not concern.

⁷¹ MacKay (1957) 14-15.

supplication and Aeneas' response, Vergil has Aeneas deliver it *after* their speeches. In this way, Vergil transforms what in the *Iliad* is a fairly minor decision (i.e., how to treat Hector's body) into not just a major decision, but *the* major decision of the poem.⁷² Will Aeneas kill Turnus or spare Turnus? Whereas Achilles needs no time to make his minor decision, Aeneas hesitates over his major one⁷³:

*stetit acer in armis
Aeneas uoluens oculos dextramque repressit;
et iam iamque magis cunctantem flectere sermo
coeperat...*
(*Aen.* 12.938-941)

Aeneas stood, fierce in his arms, whirling his eyes around, and he checked his hand. And now more and more his [Turnus'] speech began to sway him as he delayed...

Unlike Achilles, Aeneas stops, listens, and considers. In this moment, brief as it may be, Aeneas stands as the fulfillment of the Roman heroic ideal suggested by Anchises' previously quoted dictum: "*parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*, to spare the conquered and war down the proud" (*Aen.* 6.853). Having conquered Turnus—having warred down the proud—Aeneas begins to realize that he not only can, but should, spare his foe. Aeneas begins to realize that Roman *pietas* and *ratio* may be more appropriate here than Homeric *furor* and *ira*.

⁷² The major decision of the poem is also, in many ways, the major question of *Aeneid* scholarship. How are we to understand Aeneas' killing of Turnus? Like most subjects of Vergilian scholarship, Aeneas' killing of Turnus has received no shortage of treatment. Broadly speaking, there are two rival schools of thought on the subject: the European or "optimistic" school and the Harvard or "pessimistic" school. The European school, as a rule, maintains that Aeneas is ultimately justified in his killing of Turnus, and that the ending is therefore unproblematic and untroubling; the Harvard school, by contrast, maintains that Aeneas is not justified in his killing of Turnus, and that the ending is therefore highly problematic and troubling. For European school interpretations, see Karl Galinsky, "The Anger of Aeneas," *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 109, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988), and Brooks Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1964) 378-382. For Harvard school interpretations, see Johnson (1976) 114-134 and Michael Putnam, *The Poetry of the Aeneid: Four Studies in Imaginative Design*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988) 192-201.

⁷³ Gransden (1984) 213 correctly observes that what constitutes the surprise at poem's end is not that Aeneas kills Turnus, but that he hesitates in doing so. "What ought to surprise the reader, or so it seems to me, is not that Aeneas does not spare Turnus, but that he should have hesitated at all. The hesitation constitutes the surprise."

However, if Vergil briefly highlights Aeneas' *pietas* and *ratio*, he promptly underscores the failure of Aeneas' *pietas* and *ratio* with a further manipulation of the prelude to Achilles' response to Hector's supplication. Throughout *Iliad* 18-22, Patroclus is never far from Achilles' mind. Devastated by Patroclus' death, Achilles desires nothing more than to kill Hector and thereby avenge his friend. The duel between Achilles and Hector, therefore, is effectively a personal affair: Achilles wants revenge, and he aims to exact that revenge from Hector.⁷⁴ In the *Aeneid*, however, the duel between Aeneas and Turnus is, initially at least, something different. Unlike the duel of Achilles and Hector, the duel of Aeneas and Turnus is conceived of as a historical affair, a matter of fate and destiny. As Jupiter and Juno make clear in their reconciliation,⁷⁵ Aeneas' and Turnus' duel will mean the union of Trojans and Latins, and, therefore, the ultimate establishment of Rome. In the immediate aftermath of Turnus' supplication—and, in fact, throughout Book 12—Aeneas himself regards the duel in this way; he sees the duel as the means to a higher end.⁷⁶ However, just as Aeneas seems poised to attain that higher end, the personal dimension reenters the picture. When Aeneas sees Pallas' baldric hanging from Turnus' shoulder, he remembers his Patroclus:

...*infelix umero cum apparuit alto*
balteus et notis fulserunt cingula bullis
Pallantis pueri, uictum quem uulnere Turnus
strauerat atque umeris inimicum insigne gerebat.
ille, oculis postquam saeui monimenta doloris
exuuiasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira
terribilis...

⁷⁴ Lyne (1987) 112.

⁷⁵ Jupiter and Juno's last meeting is typically described as reconciliation. However, as Johnson (1976) 123-127 suggests, "reconciliation" may be the wrong word to describe the final meeting of the king and queen of Olympus. In the end, Juno does not, as many scholars maintain, fully submit to the will of Jupiter. Instead, Jupiter in many ways submits to the will of Juno. First, Jupiter, despite Juno's constant violation of his will and plans, lets his wife go unpunished, and even yields to her wish that the Latins subsume the Trojans in name, speech, and dress. Second, Jupiter dispatches a Dira, a hellish creature that perfectly embodies Juno's *furor* and *ira*, to preside over the conclusion of Aeneas' and Turnus' duel. In short, Juno's reconciliation is less sincere than it first appears; reconciliation, to invert Clausewitz's famous saying, proves to be the continuation of war by other means.

⁷⁶ Lyne (1987) 112.

(*Aen.* 12.941-947)

...when the sad baldric appeared on his tall shoulder and the young Pallas' belt flashed with its familiar studs, the boy whom, when conquered by his wound, Turnus had slain and whose belt Turnus wore upon his shoulders as a hateful trophy. After he drank in with his eyes the memorials and spoils of his savage pain, he spoke terribly, inflamed with rage and terrible in his anger...

In an instant, the duel ceases to be the higher, historical affair Aeneas conceives of it as being and becomes the savage, personal affair Achilles conceives of it as being. In an instant, in other words, Aeneas' *pietas* and *ratio* give way to *furor* and *ira*. While Aeneas is able to project *pietas* and *ratio* for a time, able to suppress *furor* and *ira*, it is only for a time. Like Achilles, Aeneas, cannot suppress who he fundamentally is. For all of his *pietas* and *ratio*, Aeneas remains, even at poem's end, more Achilles than Augustus, more Homeric than Roman.

Finally, Vergil highlights not just the failure but the perversion of Aeneas' *pietas* and *ratio* by manipulating Achilles' speech itself. In *Iliad* 22, Achilles' response to Hector's supplication confirms that Achilles himself views his killing of Hector as an act of vengeance. Achilles says: “αἱ γὰρ πῶς αὐτόν με μένος καὶ θυμὸς ἀνείη // ὥμ' ἀποταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἷα ἔοργας, If only somehow my strength and spirit would allow me myself to rend and eat your flesh raw, such things as you have done” (*Il.* 346-347). Despite his passion and rage—his *furor* and *ira*—Achilles shows in these first lines a clear-eyed view of why he kills Hector: in order to requite “οἷα ἔοργας, such things as you [Hector] have done [me]” (*Il.* 22.347). Achilles shows, in other words, that for all of his passion and rage, he is still very much in control. In the *Aeneid*, however, Aeneas is not so clear-eyed and not so in control. When Aeneas responds to Turnus' supplication, he says: “*Pallas te hoc uulnere, Pallas // immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit*, Pallas sacrifices you with this wound, Pallas exacts punishment from your criminal blood (*Aen.* 12.948-949). First, unlike Achilles, who takes full ownership for his killing of Hector—

who in fact revels in that ownership—Aeneas shies away from assuming the responsibility for the deed; instead, he attributes the responsibility to someone else: to Pallas, Turnus' victim. Second, Aeneas mistakenly—and disturbingly—describes his killing with the verb *immolare*, a verb that means “to sacrifice.” In these two ways, Aeneas thus demonstrates that he views his final act as religiously sanctioned—as an expression, in effect, of his *pietas*.⁷⁷ In this belief, however, Aeneas is deluded. Aeneas' killing of Turnus, like Achilles' killing of Hector, is nothing other than an act of vengeance, nothing other than an expression of *furor* and *ira*. While Achilles' killing of Hector is horrific, it is, in the heroic world of the *Iliad*, both just and necessary. Aeneas' killing of Turnus, however, is neither just nor necessary; it is simply horrific.

Of all the Homeric allusions considered thus far, the allusion to Achilles at poem's end disturbs and troubles most. With the allusion to Agamemnon earlier in Book 12, Vergil hints at Aeneas' limitations as a leader, Aeneas' inability, in many respects, to control events around him. With the allusion to Achilles at the end of Book 12, however, Vergil points to deeper and darker truths about Aeneas. In the final moments of the poem, Aeneas' struggle is no longer with men, gods, and fate; it is with himself. Unlike Achilles, Aeneas realizes in his moment of victory that he has a choice: he can either kill Turnus or spare him. With this simple but profound realization, Aeneas seems poised to fulfill his father's exhortation to spare the conquered and war down the proud, poised to usher in an age of *pietas* and *ratio*, rather than *furor* and *ira*. Yet, as so often, the past dies hard. When Aeneas catches sight of Pallas' baldric, he shows an inability not just to control events around him; he shows an inability to control himself. In the critical moment, Aeneas sacrifices *pietas* and *ratio* and embraces *furor* and *ira*. In the critical moment, in other words, Aeneas becomes Achilles. Tragically, however, Aeneas

⁷⁷ King (1987) 55 brilliantly distills the ultimate perversion of Aeneas' *pietas*: “When Aeneas kills Turnus and says that Pallas “sacrifices him, he is exhibiting not an enthusiastic Roman *pietas* but a sanctimonious Homeric fury. The worst of two epic worlds combine in an act that is personal vengeance conceived as religious duty.”

does not become Achilles enough. While Aeneas plays the role of Achilles at poem's end, it is the Achilles of *Iliad* 22, not *Iliad* 24. Unlike the latter Achilles, the Achilles who rejoins the human community by crying with Priam for the common suffering of mankind, Aeneas knows no redemption.⁷⁸ Aeneas begins in darkness and ends in darkness. Ultimately, by inviting such comparisons and contrasts, the allusion to Achilles suggests that Aeneas' victory is not Actium, but Asculum, not Augustan, but Pyrrhic.

⁷⁸ Putnam (1988) 196.

Chapter 3: Turnus Homeric Roles in Book 12

This chapter focuses on Turnus' Homeric roles in Book 12. Throughout Book 12, as shown in the Introduction, Turnus plays a fair number of Homeric roles: Hector, Paris, Achilles, etc. While the identification of Turnus' Homeric roles is thus, like the identification of Aeneas' Homeric roles, fairly clear, the meaning and significance of these roles is not. The aim of this chapter, therefore, is to address the same questions of Turnus' Homeric roles that were asked of Aeneas' Homeric roles in the previous chapter: Why does Turnus play the Homeric roles he does in Book 12? What do these Homeric roles reveal about Turnus and the *Aeneid* itself? In order to address these questions about Turnus' Homeric roles, this chapter will consider two Homeric roles that Turnus plays in Book 12: Paris and Hector.

Turnus as Paris

*tum sic adfatur regem atque ita turbidus infit:
'nulla mora in Turno; nihil est quod dicta retractent
ignavi Aeneadae, nec quae pepigere recusant:
congregior. fer sacra, pater, et concipe foedus.
aut hac Dardanium dextra sub Tartara mittam,
desertorem Asiae (sedeant spectentque Latini),
et solus ferro crimen commune refellam,
aut habeat uictos, cedat Lauinia coniunx.'*
(Aen. 12.10-17)

Then, in this way, he [Turnus] speaks to the king and, so vehement, begins: "No delay for Turnus; there is no chance that the cowardly sons of Aeneas will retract their words, nor reject what they have agreed to. I am going out to meet him. Perform the sacrifices, father, and conclude a truce. Either I shall cast the Dardanian down to Tartarus with this hand of mine, Asia's renegade (and let the Latins sit and watch), and I alone shall refute the reproach against us all with my sword, or let him rule us in our defeat, let Lavinia go to him as his wife."

Τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής·

“Ἔτκορ, ἐπεὶ με κατ’ αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ’ ὑπὲρ αἶσαν,—
αἰεὶ τοι κραδίη πέλεκυς ὥς ἐστιν ἀτειρής,
ὅς τ’ εἶσιν διὰ δουρὸς ὑπ’ ἀνέρος, ὅς ῥά τε τέχνη
νήϊον ἐκτάμνησιν, ὁφέλλει δ’ ἀνδρὸς ἐρωήν·
ὥς σοὶ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόος ἐστὶ.—
μή μοι δῶρ’ ἐρατὰ πρόφερε χρυσέης Ἀφροδίτης·
οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητ’ ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα,
ὅσσα κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσιν, ἐκὼν δ’ οὐκ ἂν τις ἔλοιτο·
νῦν αὖτ’ εἴ μ’ ἐθέλεις πολεμίζειν ἢ δὲ μάχεσθαι,
ἄλλους μὲν κάθισον Τρῶας καὶ πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς,
αὐτὰρ ἐμ’ ἐν μέσσω καὶ ἀρηίφιλον Μενέλαον
συμβάλετ’ ἀμφ’ Ἑλένη καὶ κτήμασι πᾶσι μάχεσθαι·
ὁππότερος δὲ κε νικήσῃ κρείσσων τε γένηται,
κτῆμαθ’ ἐλὼν εὖ πάντα γυναῖκα τε οἶκαδ’ ἀγέσθω·
οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι φιλότητα καὶ ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες
ναίοιτε Τροίην ἐριβώλακα, τοὶ δὲ νεέσθων
Ἄργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον καὶ Ἀχαιίδα καλλιγύναικα.”
(*Il.* 3.58-75)

But in turn Alexander [Paris], god-like in appearance, addressed him: “Hector, since you have rebuked me in a fitting way, and not beyond what is fitting—always your heart is like an unyielding axe which cleaves through wood with the help of a man who cuts ship timber with skill, and strengthens a man’s swing; just so is the heart in your chest unable to be frightened—do not reproach me with the lovely gifts of golden Aphrodite; the far-famed gifts of the gods, I tell you, are not to be rejected, as many as they themselves give, though no one would willingly choose them. But now if you want me to go to war and fight, sit the rest of the Trojans and all the Achaeans down, and set me and Menelaus, dear to Ares, against one another in the middle of the armies to fight for Helen and all her possessions; and whoever wins and proves stronger, let him in fact take all her possessions and lead the woman home; and may the rest of you, having confirmed binding oaths of friendship, dwell in fertile Troy, and may they return home to horse-pasturing Argos and Achaea with its beautiful women.”

Early in Book 12, Vergil presents Turnus in one of his many secondary Homeric roles:

Paris. As with Aeneas’ Homeric roles considered in the previous chapter, Vergil leaves the reader a number of textual signals by which to detect the Paris allusion. First, as often, the general situation in the *Aeneid* passage resembles that in the *Iliad* passage. As *Iliad* 3 opens, the Greeks and Trojans stand poised to recommence hostilities. However, before the two armies can meet, Paris agrees to face Menelaus in single combat as a means of resolving the war. Similarly, as *Aeneid* 12 begins, the Trojans and Latins lie encamped near each other, prepared to resume the

fighting from the previous day. In the interim, however, Turnus volunteers to face Aeneas in single combat as a means of bringing a resolution to the war. Second, Turnus' speech itself resembles Paris' speech in certain ways. Both Turnus and Paris address their major superiors in their respective speeches (i.e., Latinus/Hector); both Turnus and Paris bid their superiors to take certain actions in preparation for their respective duels; both Turnus and Paris discuss the possible outcomes of their respective duels.

While these textual signals suggest an allusion to Paris at work in Turnus' initial speech in Book 12, they do not, as usual, reveal the meaning of the allusion. Instead, they indicate that further interpretation and analysis are required. Unfortunately, of all the Homeric roles considered thus far, Turnus' role as Paris has received by far the most limited—and wanting—treatment. Virtually the only scholar to discuss Turnus' role as Paris is Anderson, and his discussion leaves much to be desired. In Anderson's view, Turnus' role as Paris suggests that Turnus has taken on the mantle of Homer's Trojans; that Turnus is on the perjured and losing side in Vergil's *Iliad*. In this view, Anderson is of course not completely wrong. Turnus does indeed play largely, though not exclusively, Trojan roles, and he does stand as the leader of the perjured and losing side in the war between Trojans and Latins. However, Anderson's view is far from the whole story. Like Aeneas' Homeric roles, Turnus' role as Paris highlights not only what side Turnus is on, but who he is as a character. Thus, with the allusion to Paris at the beginning of Book 12, Vergil highlights two of Turnus' dominant characteristics: his *uiolentia*, "violence" or "vehemence,"⁷⁹ and his *superbia*, "arrogance."⁸⁰

⁷⁹ *Uiolentia* is to Turnus what *pietas* is to Aeneas. Indeed, as Williams (2006) 439 notes, Vergil attributes *uiolentia* to Turnus alone in the *Aeneid*. The narrator attributes *uiolentia* to Turnus three times: (*Aen.* 11.376, 12.10, 12.45); Drances, Turnus' antagonist in the Latin council in Book 11, indirectly attributes it to Turnus once (*Aen.* 11.354).

⁸⁰ Hight (1972) 217 implies, though does not explicitly say, that the Paris allusion highlights Turnus' *superbia*: "Turnus expresses sentiments like those of Paris to Hector (*Il.* 3.59-75); but he is far more arrogant."

Initially, Vergil highlights Turnus' *uiolentia* by manipulating the prelude to Paris' speech. In the lead-up to Paris' speech, Homer stresses Paris' cowardice and effeminacy. Despite his initial challenge to the Greeks to fight,⁸¹ Paris sheepishly retreats when Menelaus steps forward to accept the challenge. While Paris subsequently agrees to face Menelaus, he does so only after he has heard Hector's harsh rebuke, only after he has been publically shamed. His decision, therefore, is less that of a true hero than that of a chastened coward. In *Aeneid* 12, however, the prelude to Turnus' speech differs significantly from that to Paris' speech. While Turnus does not issue a challenge to the Trojans prior to his speech, he also does not shrink from facing Aeneas or need to be shamed into doing so. On the contrary, as the opening lion simile suggests, Turnus can barely be restrained from going out to meet his foe:

*Poenorum quails in aruis
saucius ille graui uenantum uulnere pectus
tum demum mouet arma leo, gaudetque comantis
excutiens ceruice toros fixumque latronis
impauidus frangit telum et fremit ore cruento:
haud secus accenso gliscit uiolentia Turno.*
(*Aen.* 12.4-9)

Just as that lion in Punic fields, injured in its chest by a grievous wound from hunters, then at last goes into battle, and rejoices as it shakes the shaggy muscles on its neck and, undaunted, breaks the brigand's shaft and roars with its bloody mouth: not otherwise does Turnus' violence grow as he becomes set alight with passion.

While Vergil explicitly refers to Turnus' *uiolentia* in the lion simile, he indirectly refers to it in the introductory line to Turnus' speech, too. Whereas Paris is θεοειδής, "god-like in

⁸¹ Kirk (1985) 268 notes the ambiguity in Paris' challenge. The verb Homer uses to describe Paris' challenge is προκαλίζετο, "to call forth," a verb that could imply either single combat or general combat. Kirk writes: "Whether that means in single combat or not is doubtful; Leaf has drawn attention to the implications of [line] 20 ἐν ἀνῇ δῆϊοτῇτι [in terrible battle], which suggests a general encounter." Whether Paris envisions single combat or general combat, however, means less than Kirk implicitly suggests. After all, general combat in Homer is not combat between units, but between individuals. Homeric "general" combat is merely large scale single combat.

appearance,” (*Il.* 3.58)⁸² as he makes his speech, Turnus is “*ita turbidus*, so vehement” (*Aen.* 12.10). In short, while Paris is cowardly and effeminate prior to his speech, Turnus is aggressive, passionate, insistent—filled, in other words, with *uiolentia*.

Vergil further highlights Turnus’ *uiolentia* by significantly altering the introduction of Paris’ speech. In *Iliad* 3, the introduction to Paris’ speech, the part leading up to his agreement to fight Menelaus, is remarkable both for its length and tone. In terms of length, Paris spends eight lines (*Il.* 3.59-66)—nearly half his speech—building up to his main subject. In terms of tone, however, the speech is even more remarkable. Throughout the introduction to his speech, Paris strikes a calm and deferential, rather than angry and antagonistic, tone. First and foremost, rather than lighting into Hector for his harsh words, Paris acknowledges the fairness of what his brother said: “Ἔτκορ, ἐπεὶ με κατ’ αἴσαν ἐνέικεσας οὐδ’ ὑπὲρ αἴσαν..., Hector, since you have rebuked me in a fitting way, and not beyond what it fitting...” (*Il.* 3.59). Second, rather than telling Hector that he is harsh and pitiless, Paris couches this sentiment in a seemingly flattering simile⁸³:

αἰεὶ τοι κραδίη πέλεκυς ὥς ἐστιν ἀτειρής,
ὅς τ’ εἰσιν διὰ δούρου ὑπ’ ἀνέρος, ὅς ῥά τε τέχνη
νήϊον ἐκτάμνησιν, ὀφέλλει δ’ ἀνδρὸς ἐρωήν·
ὥς σοὶ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νόος ἐστί...
(*Il.* 3.60-63)

Always your heart is like an unyielding axe which cleaves through wood with the help of a man who cuts ship timber with skill, and strengthens a man’s swing; just so is the heart in your chest unable to be frightened...

⁸² Griffin (1980) 83-84 remarks that Homer’s choice of θεοειδής to describe Paris here is particularly fitting: “For the poet makes it very clear that the beauty of Paris is what characterizes him, and is at variance with his lack of heroism... Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής, ‘Paris, beautiful as a god’, was no mere ‘formulaic epithet’ without particular significance: δέισας Ἀτρεὺς υἱὸν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής is one of those pregnant lines which sum up a whole character and a whole situation.”

⁸³ Kirk (1985) 273 notes the subtlety of Paris’ simile: “The purpose of this simile is indeed rhetorical—in this case, to flatter, but also to delay a disingenuous and somewhat waspish conclusion—and not diversionary, or offering the contrast of a different scene, as so often in narrative.”

Finally, rather than berating Hector for besmirching the gifts of Aphrodite, Paris simply tells him not to do so:

...μή μοι δῶρ' ἔρατὰ πρόφερε χρυσέης Ἀφροδίτης·
οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα,
ὅσσα κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσιν, ἔκων δ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἔλοιτο...
(*Il.* 3.64-66)

...do not reproach me with the lovely gifts of golden Aphrodite; the far-famed gifts of the gods, I tell you, are not to be rejected, as many as they themselves give, though no one would willingly choose them...

The introduction to Turnus' speech, however, is a study in contrast. In a sense, Turnus' speech has no introduction. Unlike Paris, Turnus has no time for similes and concessions, calmness and deference; Turnus has time for one thing, and one thing alone: his duel with Aeneas. What introduction there is—"nulla mora in Turno...", no delay for Turnus..." (*Aen.* 12.12)—neatly reflects Turnus' myopic view of the duel. Ultimately, that Turnus does not or cannot manage more than this blunt fragment by way of introduction, that Turnus does not or cannot manage even a simple acknowledgement of the people to whom he is speaking, highlights his vehemence, aggression, and passion—highlights, once again, his *uiolentia*.

However, if Vergil highlights Turnus' *uiolentia* by manipulating the prelude and introduction to Paris' speech, he also highlights the Latin hero's *superbia* by altering the body of Paris' speech. When Paris begins to speak about the duel with Menelaus, he exhibits none of the boastfulness and haughtiness he exhibited prior to Hector's rebuke. Not only does he refrain from insulting or belittling Menelaus and the Greeks; he also refrains from doing what almost every hero in his situation does—predicting his own victory. Instead, he speaks as though both victory and defeat are real possibilities: "...ὁππότερος δέ κε νικήσῃ κρείσσων τε γένηται, // κτήμαθ' ἑλὼν εἴ πάντα γυναικὰ τε οἴκαδ' ἄγέσθω..., ...and whoever wins and proves stronger, let him in fact take all her possessions and lead the woman home..." (*Il.* 3.71-72). In the body of

Turnus' speech, however, boastfulness and haughtiness reign supreme. On the one hand, Turnus shows nothing but contempt for Aeneas and the Trojans. Turnus refers to the Trojans as "*ignavi Aeneadae*, the cowardly sons of Aeneas" (*Aen.* 12.12), and to Aeneas as "*desertorem Asiae*, Asia's renegade" (*Aen.* 12.15). On the other hand, Turnus shows nothing but pride and self-confidence in himself. In speaking of the duel, Turnus implies that there is only one possible outcome—his own victory: "*aut hac Dardanium dextra sub Tartara mittam...*, Either I will cast the Dardanian down to Tartarus with this right hand of mine..." (*Aen.* 12.14).⁸⁴ Moreover, Turnus suggests that he, and he alone, is capable of facing Aeneas: "...*et solus ferro crimen commune refellam...*, ...and I alone will refute the charge against us all with my sword..." (*Aen.* 12.16); and that the Latins should hold back while he, the real warrior, risks his life: "*sedeant spectentque Latini*, and let the Latins sit and watch" (*Aen.* 12.15).⁸⁵

Furthermore, Vergil highlights Turnus' *superbia* by altering Paris' interaction with his addressee. In his speech, Paris addresses Hector, his elder brother and commander. Consequently, Paris speaks, as noted above, with a degree of deference. Not only does Paris agree to do what Hector wants, but he *respectfully* agrees to do what Hector wants. Not surprisingly, Turnus' interaction with his addressee differs substantially. In his speech, Turnus addresses Latinus, a man who, like Hector to Paris, is both his elder and his commander. However, unlike Paris, Turnus speaks to Latinus not deferentially, but imperiously. Midway through his speech, Turnus bluntly and abruptly commands Latinus to make preparations for the

⁸⁴ While Turnus' initial *aut*, "either," clause is followed by a second *aut* clause, this second *aut* clause does not foresee Aeneas' victory in the duel. Instead, the second *aut* clause, as indicated by the hortatory subjunctives, deals with what will happen if there is no duel: "...*aut habeat uictos, cedat Lauinia coniunx.*, or let him [Aeneas] rule us in our defeat, and let Lavinia go to him as a wife" (*Aen.* 12.17). In other words, Turnus implies that if Latinus does not allow a duel to take place the Latins are doomed to lose.

⁸⁵ Highet (1972) 217 argues that Turnus' "*sedeant spectentque Latini*" is not just a sign of arrogance, but an insult directed at Latinus. "When he [Turnus] insults Latinus by saying that his subjects should be content to sit and watch while he himself risks his life, '*sedeant spectentque Latini*,' (*Aen.* 12.15), he is repeating, and, by addressing it directly to their monarch, aggravating a taunt he has already uttered, '*pacem laudate sedentes*' (*Aen.* 11.460)."

duel: “*fer sacra, pater, et concipe foedus*, perform the sacrifices, father, and confirm a truce”

(*Aen.* 12.13). While Paris issues a similar command in his speech, it follows upon Hector’s implicit command that a duel take place. Turnus’ command, by contrast, follows upon nothing Latinus has said. In fact, in Book 11, Latinus makes it clear that he wishes to conclude peace with the Trojans rather than to continue fighting them:

*haec omnis regio et celsi plaga pinea montis
cedat amicitiae Teucrorum, et foederis aequas
dicamus leges sociosque in regna uocemus:
considant, si tantus amor, et moenia condant.*
(*Aen.* 11.320-323)

Let the whole region and pine-filled area with its lofty mountain be given over as a token of our friendship towards the Trojans, and let us declare fair laws for a treaty, and let us summon them as friends into our kingdom; let them settle and build walls, if they have such great longing to do so.

Turnus’ command, therefore, is all the more striking, all the more presumptuous. Turnus has the audacity not just to give Latinus orders, but to give Latinus orders that he knows the king does not support. He has the audacity—the *superbia*—to speak as though he were king.

In conclusion, of all the Homeric roles considered thus far, Turnus’ role as Paris proves the most ironic. Paris, as depicted in *Iliad* 3, is a paper tiger, a warrior with more bark than bite. While he eventually agrees to face Menelaus, Homer reveals him for what he is: a lover in warrior’s garb. Turnus, on the other hand, is anything but a paper tiger at the beginning of *Aeneid* 12. As the allusion to Paris highlights by way of contrast, Turnus is fundamentally a creature of *uiolentia* and *superbia*, a warrior through and through. However, the irony does not stop there. While Turnus may be a real tiger at the beginning of Book 12, he soon becomes a paper tiger, too. When Aeneas and Latinus have sworn their oaths in preparation for the duel, Turnus begins to lose heart:

adiuuat incessu tacito progressus et aram

*suppliciter uenerans demisso lumine Turnus
pubentesque genae et iuuenali in corpore pallor.
(Aen. 12.219-221)*

Turnus, having made his way to the altar with silent footsteps, increases their [the Latins'] anxiety as he worships humbly with his eyes downcast, just as his youthful cheeks and the pallor on his young body do also.

Turnus' momentary loss of heart, however, soon becomes full-blown cowardice. When Aeneas seeks Turnus out after their formal duel has been disrupted, Turnus deliberately avoids him.

Thus, while the Paris allusion highlights Turnus' *uiolentia* and *superbia*, it also seems to foreshadow the failure of these very heroic qualities. Turnus' speech to Latinus, in other words, functions not only as an allusion to Paris' speech to Hector, but as an allusion to Paris' initial, swaggering challenge to the Greeks. Ultimately, as the allusion to Paris suggests, Turnus has something of a real tiger and a paper tiger in him.

Turnus as Hector

*Turnus ad haec:
'o soror, et dudum agnoui, cum prima per artem
foedera turbasti teque haec in bella dedisti,
et nunc nequiquam fallis dea. Sed quis Olympo
demissam tantos uoluit te ferre labores?
an fratris miseri letum ut crudele uideres?
nam quid ago? Aut quae iam spondet Fortuna salutem?
uidi oculos ante ipse meos me voce uocantem
Murranum, quo non superat mihi carior alter,
oppetere ingentem atque ingenti uulnere uictum.
occidit infelix ne nostrum dedecus Vfers
aspiceret; Teucris potiuntur corpore et armis.
exscindine domos (id rebus defuit unum)
perpetiar, dextra nec Drancidis dicta refellam?
terga dabo et Turnum fugientem haec terra uidebit?
usque adeone mori miserum est? uos o mihi, Manes,
este boni, quoniam superis auersa uoluntas.
sancta ad uos anima atque istius inscia culpa
descendam magnorum haud umquam indignus auorum.'*
(Aen. 12.632-649)

Turnus said in response to these things: “Oh sister, I have recognized you ever since you first skillfully broke the pact and gave yourself over to these battles, and now you pretend to be a goddess for naught. But who wished to send you down from Olympus and for you to bear such great labors? Or was it so that you might see the cruel death of your wretched brother? For what am I to do? Or what Fortune now promises salvation? Before my own eyes I have seen giant Murranus, a man I held dearer than any other, perish and succumb to his giant wound as he called out to me with his voice. Unfortunate Ufens has died lest he behold my disgrace. The Teucrians have gotten hold of his body and arms. Shall I allow our homes to be torn apart—this alone has yet to be done in all this—and shall I not refute the words of Drances with my hand? Shall I turn tail and shall this land see Turnus fleeing? Is it so very wretched to die? Be good to me, you shades of the dead, since the gods have turned away their good-will. I shall descend to you a purified soul ignorant of that guilt, in no way unworthy of my great forebears.”

ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγάλητορα θυμόν·
“ὦ μοι ἔγών, εἰ μὲν κε πύλας καὶ τείχεα δύω,
Πουλυδάμας μοι πρῶτος ἐλεγχείην ἀναθήσει,
ὅς μ' ἐκέλευε Τρωσὶ ποτὶ πτόλιν ἡγήσασθαι
νύχθ' ὑπο τήνδ' ὀλοήν, ὅτε τ' ὤρετο διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς.
ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην· ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν.
νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ὤλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἐμῇσιν,
αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους,
μή ποτέ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμείο·
“Ἐκτωρ ἦφι βίηφι πιθήσας ὤλεσε λαόν.”
ὥς ἐρέουσιν· ἐμοὶ δὲ τότε· ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη
ἄντην ἢ Ἀχιλλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι,
ἦέ κεν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι εὐκλειῶς πρὸ πόλης.
εἰ δὲ κεν ἀσπίδα μὲν καταθείομαι ὀμφαλόεσσαν
καὶ κόρυθα βριαρὴν, δόρυ δὲ πρὸς τείχος ἐρείσας
αὐτός ἰὼν Ἀχιλλῆος ἀμύμονος ἀντίος ἔλθω
καὶ οἱ ὑπόσχωμαι Ἑλένην καὶ κτήμαθ' ἅμ' αὐτῇ,
πάντα μάλ' ὅσσα τ' Ἀλέξανδρος κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσὶν
ἡγάγετο Τροίηνδ', ἦ τ' ἐπλετο νείκεος ἀρχή,
δωσέμεν Ἀτρείδῃσιν ἄγειν, ἅμα δ' ἀμφὶς Ἀχαιοῖς
ἄλλ' ἀποδάσσεσθαι, ὅσα τε πτόλις ἦδε κέκευθε·
Τρωσὶν δ' αὖ μετόπισθε γερούσιον ὄρκον ἔλωμαι
μή τι κατακρύψειν, ἀλλ' ἀνδιχα πάντα δάσασθαι
κτῆσιν ὅσῃν πτολίεθρον ἐπήρατον ἐντὸς ἔεργει·
ἀλλὰ τί μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;
μή μιν ἐγὼ μὲν ἴκωμαι ἰὼν, ὁ δὲ μ' οὐκ ἐλεήσει
οὐδέ τί μ' αἰδέσεται, κτενέει δὲ με γυμνὸν ἐόντα
αὕτως ὥς τε γυναῖκα, ἐπεὶ κ' ἀπὸ τεύχεα δύω.
οὐ μὲν πῶς νῦν ἔστιν ἀπὸ δρυὸς οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης
τῷ ὀαρίζεσθαι, ἃ τε παρθένος ἥϊθέος τε,
παρθένος ἥϊθέος τ' ὀαρίζετον ἀλλήλοισιν.
βέλτερον αὖτ' ἔριδι ξυνελαυνέμεν ὅττι τάχιστα·
εἶδομεν ὅπποτέρῳ κεν Ὀλύμπιος εὖχος ὀρέξῃ”
(*Il.* 22.99-130)

And vexed, he spoke to his great-hearted soul: “Oh woe is me, if I enter the gates and walls, Polydamas will be the first to lay a reproach against me, he who bid me to lead the Trojans to the city on that ruinous night when godlike Achilles roused himself up. But I didn’t heed him; truly it would have been much better if I had. Now since I have destroyed the army by my recklessness, I am ashamed before the Trojan men and women with their long, trailing robes, lest someday someone else who is worse than I may say: ‘Hector destroyed the army by trusting in his might and strength.’ Thus they will speak. But it would be much better, then, to face Achilles and kill him, or to be killed by him gloriously before the city. However, if I put down my embossed shield and my heavy helmet, and lean my spear against the walls and go out myself to meet blameless Achilles face to face and promise him that I will allow the sons of Atreus to lead away Helen and all the possessions with her that Alexander brought to Troy in his hollow ships, and to distribute the other things amongst the Achaeans, as much as this city hides; and if in turn I take an oath before the Trojan elders that I will not conceal anything, but will divide in half all the possessions that our lovely city holds within it...but why does my heart ponder these things? Let it not be that I go out to face him, for he will not take pity on me nor respect me at all, but will kill me in my nakedness just as if I were a woman, whenever I remove my arms. It is not possible now, in any way, to flirt from a tree or a rock, as both the maiden and the young man do, as the maiden and the young man flirt with one another. Better, instead, to meet him in strife as quickly as possible; let us see to which man the Olympian extends the glory.”

In the middle of Book 12, Vergil presents Turnus in his primary Homeric role: Hector. Like Aeneas’ role as Achilles, Turnus’ role as Hector lasts well beyond a single scene or episode. From the beginning to the end of Book 12—from Latinus’ and Amata’s pleas to Turnus not to face Aeneas to Turnus’ ultimate death at the hands of Aeneas—Turnus plays, more or less continuously, the role of Homer’s greatest Trojan hero. Thus, as in the case of Aeneas’ role as Achilles, investigation of Turnus’ role as Hector may begin at any number of points. A particularly promising point of departure, however, is Turnus’ speech to his sister, Juturna, prior to facing Aeneas in single combat. As with Aeneas’ speech to Turnus at poem’s end, Turnus’ speech to Juturna represents his major choice in Book 12, his decision on whether to face Aeneas or not. Therefore, this speech promises to reveal much about Turnus, and perhaps, more indirectly, the *Aeneid* itself.

Like all the Homeric allusions considered thus far, Turnus' speech to Juturna provides a number of textual signals to confirm the existence of an allusion to Hector. First and foremost, Turnus' situation at this point in the narrative closely resembles Hector's situation early in *Iliad* 22. As *Iliad* 22 opens, Hector stands alone outside the walls of Troy. With the Trojans in flight and Achilles in pursuit, Hector considers what to do. After a lengthy soliloquy, he resolves to stand and face his foe. Similarly, when Turnus hears that the Latins have been put to flight and that Aeneas is besieging the Latin capital, Turnus considers what to do. After a lengthy speech to his Juturna, Turnus resolves to go and meet his foe. Second, Turnus' speech itself roughly resembles Hector's speech. Structurally, Turnus and Hector deliver speeches with more or less three parts: (1) Lament for their current situation; (2) Consideration of two possible actions (i.e., fighting or not fighting); (3) Decision (i.e., fighting). Even on the level of content, Turnus' speech somewhat resembles Hector's speech. In both speeches, the concepts of regret, honor, and shame play a prominent role.

Once again, while these textual signals indicate an allusion to Hector at work in Turnus' speech, they do not indicate the meaning of the allusion. As in all the preceding case studies, meaning comes only through analysis and interpretation. The existing analyses and interpretations of Turnus' role as Hector, however, have, as usual, left much to be desired. Characteristically, Anderson's view of Turnus' role as Hector borders on the facile. Anderson maintains that Turnus' role as Hector, like his role as Paris, suggests that Turnus has assumed the mantle of Homer's Trojans, and that Turnus is on the perjured and losing side in Vergil's *Iliad*.⁸⁶ This is, again, largely true: Turnus does in fact play primarily (but not exclusively) Trojan roles in Vergil's *Iliad*, and Turnus is in fact on the perjured and losing side in the war. Yet, as should

⁸⁶ Anderson, (1975) 27.

be clear by now, such a straightforward and clean-cut view of Turnus' role as Hector is far from the whole story. In *Darkness Visible*, Johnson illuminates another part of the proverbial story. As discussed in the "Introduction," Johnson maintains that Turnus' role as Hector suggests not only *that* Turnus will lose, but *how* Turnus will lose. Turnus' role as Hector, Johnson argues, highlights by way of contrast Turnus' status as victim, his status as someone not fully in control of his own life and destiny.⁸⁷ However, while Turnus' victimization is a fact at poem's end, it is much less so midway through Book 12. Indeed, Turnus in his speech to Juturna shows himself more in control of his life and destiny than at any other point in Book 12. Thus, while Vergil later uses the Hector allusion to highlight Turnus' victimization, he uses it midway through Book 12 to highlight Turnus' tragic nobility.

Vergil begins to highlight Turnus' tragic nobility by altering Hector's motivation for facing Achilles. As Hector begins his soliloquy, he recalls with regret his recent decision to have the Trojans remain encamped on the plain rather than retreating to Troy—a decision that ultimately cost the Trojans heavy losses. Hector's regret, however, manifests as αἰδώς, "shame," as he considers what Polydamas, his brother who urged retreat, will say to him: "ὦ μοι ἐγών, εἰ μὲν κε πύλας καὶ τείχεα δύω, // Πουλυδάμας μοι πρῶτος ἐλεγχείην ἀναθήσει..., Oh woe is me, if I enter the gates and walls, Polydamas will be the first to lay a reproach against me..." (Il. 22.99-100). Moreover, Hector feels this same αἰδώς when he considers what the Trojan men and women will say about him:

νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ὤλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἐμῇσιν,
αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρωάδας ἑλκεσιπέπλους,
μή ποτέ τις εἴπῃσι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμείο·
'Εκτωρ ἦφι βίῃφι πιθήσας ὤλεσε λαόν.'
ὥς ἐρέουσιν...
(Il. 22. 104-108)

⁸⁷ Johnson (1976) 114-119.

Now since I have destroyed the army by my recklessness, I am ashamed before the Trojan men and women with their long, trailing robes, lest someday someone else who is worse than I may say: 'Hector destroyed the army by trusting in his might and strength.' Thus they will speak...

Immediately after speaking of his sense of αἰδώς, Hector shifts to speaking of his options. He says: “ἐμοὶ δὲ τότε ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη // ἄντην ἢ Ἀχιλλῆα κατακτείναντα νέεσθαι, // ἢ ἐκὲν αὐτῷ ὀλέσθαι εὐκλειῶς πρὸ πόλεως, but it would be much better, then, to face Achilles and kill him, or to be killed by him gloriously before the city” (*Il.* 108-110). Hector’s inferential τότε, “then,” is the key word in these lines. This single word reveals the link between Hector’s αἰδώς, and his decision⁸⁸: Hector resolves to face Achilles *because of* his αἰδώς, *because of* his fear of what others will think and say about him.⁸⁹ Thus, while Hector fights throughout the poem primarily to defend his family, people, and Troy herself, he fights in the end primarily—if not solely—to defend his honor.

In *Aeneid* 12, however, Turnus’ motivation for facing Aeneas is more complicated. Like Hector, Turnus too feels a deep sense of shame at this point in the poem. Indeed, Turnus, more so than Hector, has reason to feel shame. From the beginning of Book 12 until his speech to Juturna, Turnus continuously fails to fulfill his *deuotio*,⁹⁰ his vow to meet Aeneas in single

⁸⁸ Nicholas Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume VI: Books 21-24*, G. S. Kirk ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 118. Richardson notes: “τότε means ‘in that case,’ i.e. ‘because I fear disgrace.’”

⁸⁹ James M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994) 158. Redfield’s analysis of the role of αἰδώς (transliterated “aidos”) in Hector’s decision to face Achilles is illuminating. “Aidos, as we saw, is a socializing emotion, or rather the characteristic emotion of the social man. Through aidos the ethical judgment of others is perceived and experienced directly in the self. Aidōs is usually a good thing—but not always...One can become the victim of aidōs; that is what happens to Hector. A hero who is preeminently responsive and responsible, he is here defeated by his own characteristic goodness.”

⁹⁰ The concept of Turnus’ *deuotio* has been the subject of much scholarly debate. Many scholars, such as Hightet (1972) 63, and Agathe Thornton, in *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Vergil’s Aeneid*, (New Zealand: University of Otago Press, 1976) 136-138, rightly see Turnus’ pledge in Book 11 (“uobis animam hanc soceroque Latino // Turnus ego, haud ulli ueterum uirtute secundus, // deuoui, I, Turnus, second to none of our ancestors in virtue, have devoted this soul of mine to you and to my father-in-law, Latinus” (*Aen.* 11.440-442)) as the initial vow of a *deuotio*, a religious act of self-sacrifice in battle on behalf of one’s nation. While C. Bennett Pascal, in “The Dubious Devotion of Turnus,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-), Vol. 120, (1990), argues against such a *deuotio*, his arguments fail to convince on two counts. First, for Turnus’ *deuotio* to count as a *deuotio* it need not, as Pascal seems to believe, live up to the truly “formal” *deuotiones* of the Decii in Livy; it may

combat on behalf of Latinus and the Latin people. Thus, when Turnus realizes that the time has come either to fight or flee, his sense of shame compels him to fight. When Turnus speaks of his Polydamas stand-in, Drances, this shame motivation emerges most clearly: “...*dextra nec Drancis dicta refellam?*, and shall I not refute the words of Drances with my hand?” (*Aen.* 12.644). Yet, along with his sense of shame, Turnus feels another motivation to fight. Turnus asks rhetorically: “*exscindine domos (id rebus defuit unum) // perpetiar...?*, Shall I allow our homes to be torn apart—this alone has yet to be done in all this...?” (*Aen.* 12.643-644). With this rhetorical question, Turnus shows that he understands that his *deuotio* is not simply a personal matter; it is a matter involving his people, city, and native land. Consequently, Turnus feels a higher, less personal motivation to fight as well: the motivation to defend everything that he holds dear. In short, whereas Hector views the duel solely as a way to save face, Turnus comes to view it as a way to save face *and* save his people.

Second, Vergil highlights Turnus’ tragic nobility by eliminating the element of fantasy and escapism found in Hector’s speech.⁹¹ In the middle of his soliloquy, Hector ruminates on an alternate course of action, a course of action besides fighting Achilles:

εἰ δέ κεν ἄσπίδα μὲν καταθείομαι ὀμφαλόεσσιν
καὶ κόρυθα βριαρὴν, δόρυ δὲ πρὸς τείχος ἐρείσας
αὐτὸς ἰὼν Ἀχιλῆος ἀμύμονος ἀντίος ἔλθω
καὶ οἱ ὑπόσχωμαι Ἑλένην καὶ κτήμαθ’ ἅμ’ αὐτῇ,
πάντα μάλ’ ὅσσα τ’ Ἀλέξανδρος κοίλῃς ἐνὶ νηυσὶν
ἡγάγετο Τροίηνδ’, ἧ τ’ ἔπλετο νείκεος ἀρχή,
δωσέμεν Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἄγειν, ἅμα δ’ ἀμφὶς Ἀχαιοῖς
ἀλλ’ ἀποδάσσεσθαι, ὅσα τε πτόλις ἦδε κέκευθε·
Τρῶσιν δ’ αὖ μετόπισθε γερούσιον ὄρκον ἔλωμαι
μὴ τι κατακρύψειν, ἀλλ’ ἄνδιχα πάντα δάσσασθαι
κτῆσιν ὅσῃν πτολίεθρον ἐπήρατον ἐντὸς ἔργει·
ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;

instead be more of an “informal” or “symbolic” *deuotio*. Second, Turnus’ failure to fulfill his *deuotio* through Book 11 and for at least half of Book 12 is not, as Pascal contends, evidence against the existence of such a *deuotio*; rather, it is evidence that Turnus is terrified and overwhelmed by the prospect of fulfilling this vow.

⁹¹ Redfield (1994) 158 notes the element of fantasy and escapism in Hector’s soliloquy: “In his paralysis, Hector takes refuge in fantasy...he plays with the fantasy a moment and then lets it drop.”

(Il. 22.111-122)

However, if I put down my embossed shield and my heavy helmet, and lean my spear against the walls and go out myself to meet blameless Achilles face to face and promise him that I will allow the sons of Atreus to lead away Helen and all the possessions with her that Alexander brought to Troy in his hollow ships, and to distribute the other things amongst the Achaeans, as much as this city hides; and if in turn I take an oath before the Trojan elders that I will not conceal anything, but will divide in half all the possessions that our lovely city holds within it...but why does my heart ponder these things?

While Hector quickly thinks better of negotiating with Achilles, his thought process at this point is nevertheless revealing. For Hector, the thought of having to face Achilles is absolutely overwhelming. His first thought after contemplating this overwhelming course of action, therefore, is to consider another, less overwhelming course of action. Hector indulges, in other words, in a form of mental escapism that, while ultimately futile, nonetheless provides him a measure of temporary relief.

In his speech to Juturna, however, Turnus steadfastly avoids this sort of mental escapism. Having continuously avoided his *deuotio* throughout Book 12—having, in effect, continuously indulged in this sort of mental escapism—Turnus now soberly faces his duty and responsibility.⁹² In his newfound soberness, Turnus focuses on what his failure to fulfill his *deuotio* has cost the Latins already, and what it will likely cost them in the near future if he does not change his ways:

*uidi oculos ante ipse meos me uoce uocantem
Murratum, quo non superat mihi carior alter,
oppetere ingentem atque ingenti uulnere uictum.*

⁹² Cf. David West, “The Deaths of Hector and Turnus,” *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Apr., 1974) 22. West’s discussion of Vergil’s reorganization of the Homeric duel of Achilles and Hector bears on the passage under consideration. In examining the similarities and differences between the Homeric and the Vergilian duels, West notes that Vergil’s duel complicates Homer’s organization. Whereas Homer organizes his duel into flight followed by combat, Vergil organizes his into combat, followed by flight, followed by combat again. The reason for this difference, West argues, is, at least in part, the fact that “Turnus has been running away from Aeneas for more than three books already...Homer can afford to depict Hector in panic because Hector’s courage is beyond question. The courage of Turnus is not so securely established.” Something similar, it would seem, is at work in Turnus’ speech to Juturna. Turnus has been living in a fantasy world, a world of recklessness and irresponsibility, for the majority of Book 12. Therefore, Vergil must show the reader that there is another Turnus, a Turnus who can face duty and reality, who can be a suitable antagonist for Aeneas.

*occidit infelix ne nostrum dedecus Vfens
aspiceret; Teucri potiuntur corpore et armis.
exscindine domos (id rebus defuit unum)
perpetiar...?
(Aen. 12.638-644)*

Before my own eyes I have seen giant Murranus, a man I held dearer than any other, perish and succumb to his giant wound as he called out to me with his voice. Unfortunate Ufens has died lest he behold my disgrace. The Teucrians have gotten hold of his body and arms. Shall I allow our homes to be torn apart—this alone has yet to be done in all this...?

Turnus' implicit answer to this question is a definitive "no"; he feels he must face reality, no matter the consequences. While Turnus does mention flight as an alternative course of action at one point—"terga dabo et Turnum fugientem haec terra uidebit?", Shall I turn tail and shall this land see Turnus fleeing?" (Aen. 12.645)—it is solely for rhetorical effect. Turnus, the allusion to Hector suggests, no longer lives in the realm of fantasy and escapism, but the world of duty and responsibility.

Finally, Vergil further highlights Turnus' tragic nobility by manipulating Hector's expectations prior to facing Achilles. As Hector concludes his soliloquy, he remains uncertain about what the outcome of the duel will be. While he realizes that the duel may be his death, he still clings to the hope that he will prevail. As such, Hector's speech ends on a note of expectant optimism: "εἰδομεν ὅπποτέρῳ κεν Ὀλύμπιος εὖχος ὀρέξῃ, let us see to which man the Olympian will extend the glory" (Il. 22.130). In his speech to Juturna, however, Turnus does not feel Hector's optimism.⁹³ Instead, Turnus seems to know that the duel will be his death:

*usque adeone mori miserum est? uos o mihi, Manes,
este boni, quoniam superis auersa uoluntas.
sancta ad uos anima atque istius inscia culpa*

⁹³ Cf. Highet (1972) 215. While Highet likewise notes Turnus' lack of confidence in comparison with Hector, he views this lack of confidence as detracting from, rather than adding to, Turnus' tragic nobility: "Turnus is a weaker figure, less nobly tragic." The irony, of course, is that Turnus resolves upon an action that he knows will be his death. Whatever one wants to say about Turnus' action, it is certainly not the normal action of a "weaker" and "less nobly tragic" character.

descendam magnorum haud umquam indignus auorum.
(*Aen.* 12.646-649)

Is it so very wretched to die? Be good to me, you shades of the dead, since the gods have turned away their good-will. I shall descend to you a purified soul ignorant of that guilt [of flight], in no way unworthy of my great forebears

Not once, either in these lines or elsewhere in his speech, does Turnus contemplate victory; facing Aeneas, in Turnus' eyes, is tantamount to facing death. Yet, despite this feeling, Turnus still goes out to face Aeneas, still resolves to fulfill his *deuotio*. Thus, the allusion to Hector once again points towards the fundamental, if tragic, nobility of Turnus.

In comparison with Aeneas' role as Hector considered above, Turnus' role as Hector casts the Latin hero in a refreshingly positive light. Throughout Vergil's *Iliad*, Turnus is as much a Tragic hero as a Homeric hero.⁹⁴ From Book 9 to the middle of Book 12, Turnus' distinguishing qualities are those of many a Sophoclean or Euripidean hero (e.g., Oedipus in the *Oedipus Rex*, Pentheus in the *Bacchae*, etc.): *uiolentia* and *superbia*. In the middle of Book 12, however, Turnus has his ἀναγνώρισις, "recognition." When Turnus hears that the Trojans are on the brink of victory, Turnus finally faces reality, finally resolves to confront Aeneas and fulfill his *deuotio*. In this decision, Turnus, as highlighted by his role as Hector, assumes a newfound nobility. Whereas Hector makes his decision for solely personal reasons, Turnus makes his for both personal and more-than-personal reasons; whereas Hector lets his mind wander from the terrifying prospect of confronting Achilles, Turnus faces the prospect of confronting Aeneas unblinkingly; whereas Hector stands to meet his foe in the hope that he may yet prevail, Turnus

⁹⁴ The "Tragic" element in Turnus' character has often been remarked upon. For example, J. B. Garstang, in "The Tragedy of Turnus," *Phoenix*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Autumn, 1950), argues that Turnus' story can function as an independent, detachable tragedy on its own. To demonstrate this claim, Garstang writes a synopsis of a possible tragedy about Vergil's Turnus, which, despite some minor conventional problems (e.g., scenes of combat depicted on stage), seems plausible. Opting for a more conventional approach, E. L. Highbarger, in "The Tragedy of Turnus: A Study of Vergil, *Aeneid* XII," *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 41, No. 8 (Jan. 19, 1948), discusses the "tragic features" of Book 12, with special emphasis on the figure of Turnus' himself.

goes to meet his foe in the sure knowledge that it will mean his death. Ultimately, if Hector in his final decision to face Achilles comes across as more fallible and more human, Turnus, in his corresponding decision to face Aeneas, comes across as more heroic and more noble.

Chapter 4: Conclusion

*alius Latio iam partus Achilles,
natus et ipse dea...*
(*Aen.* 6.89-90)

another Achilles has already been born in Latium,
he himself also the son of a goddess...

With these two prophetic lines, the Sibyl presages not only Vergil's *maius opus*—Vergil's Iliad—but the phenomenon of Homeric roles that features so prominently in the *Aeneid*'s second half. Who will play the role of Achilles? Who, by extension, will play the role of Hector, Paris, Agamemnon, etc.? For years, scholars have worked to answer these questions, worked to establish which Homeric role(s) Aeneas and Turnus play in Vergil's Iliad. Not surprisingly, they have come to very different conclusions about these questions. Some have argued that Aeneas plays the role of Hector, Turnus that of Achilles; others that Aeneas plays the role of Achilles, Turnus that of Hector; still others, more reasonably, that Aeneas and Turnus play multiple Homeric roles not limited to Achilles and Hector. However, while scholars have spent a great deal of time and energy establishing *which* Homeric role(s) Aeneas and Turnus play in Vergil's Iliad, they have spent relatively little time and energy establishing *what* Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles mean and signify. This second question, therefore, formed the basis of this paper. Building on the work of Johnson, Lyne, and King, this paper aimed to investigate what Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles mean and signify, what, in effect, these Homeric roles reveal about Aeneas, Turnus, and the *Aeneid* itself.

In order to investigate the meaning and significance of Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles, this paper made use of a methodology based on Lyne's *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*.

While Lyne himself never so much as mentions the word “methodology,” his work nevertheless points to a simple and elegant system for studying Homeric allusions, and, by extension, Homeric roles. In essence, this methodology consists of three steps. The first step involves searching for “textual signals” in the *Aeneid* that recall the Homeric poems, and, therefore, suggest an allusion at work between the *Aeneid* and the Homeric poems. The second step involves comparing and contrasting the Vergilian and Homeric passages in order to see the similarities and differences between the two passages. Finally, the third step involves analyzing these similarities and differences so as to determine what the Homeric allusion—what the Homeric role—means and signifies.

Relying on this methodology, this paper examined five of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles in Book 12. The second chapter examined Aeneas’ Homeric roles as Agamemnon, Hector, and Achilles; the third chapter, Turnus’ Homeric roles as Paris and Hector. These five case studies found that each of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles highlights different aspects of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ characters, that each of their Homeric roles, in short, means and signifies different things. In Aeneas’ case, his Homeric roles highlighted his strengths and limitations as a leader (Agamemnon); his emotional limitedness (Hector); and his high ideals on the one hand, and the failure and perversion of those ideals on the other (Achilles). In Turnus’ case, his Homeric roles highlighted both his violent and arrogant nature (Paris); and his ultimate tragic nobility (Hector). In short, the paper’s underlying assumption held up: Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles *are* inherently meaningful and significant, *are* inherently capable of revealing truths about Aeneas, Turnus, and, more indirectly, the *Aeneid* itself.

From this investigation, several conclusions can be drawn about Aeneas’ and Turnus’ Homeric roles. First and foremost, the meaning and significance of Aeneas’ and Turnus’

Homeric roles is, by and large, dark, troubling, and disturbing. While Turnus' role as Hector stands as an exception to this general rule, Aeneas' and Turnus' four other Homeric roles support it. Hence Aeneas' role as Hector highlights Aeneas' emotional limitedness and Turnus' role as Paris highlights Turnus' violence and arrogance. Similarly, although they initially gesture towards Aeneas' high ideals—his *pietas* and *ratio*—Aeneas' roles as Agamemnon and Achilles ultimately highlight either the inadequacy or failure of these ideals. Thus, on the whole, Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles function as means of subverting, undermining, and questioning Aeneas' and Turnus' words and actions—of subverting, undermining, and questioning their very characters.

Second, Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles more indirectly subvert, undermine, and question the *Aeneid*' imperial message. The *Aeneid*, on one level, stands as a panegyric to Rome: Vergil's *magnum opus* celebrates the Augustan restoration of order, promise of peace, and triumph of civilization. However, if the *Aeneid* contains such an "epic voice," such an imperial, patriotic, and optimistic voice, Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles show that it contains another type of voice as well. In Lyne's terms, Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles represent "further voices," voices that somehow go against the poem's epic voice.⁹⁵ In subtle ways, Aeneas' and Turnus' Homeric roles suggest that the *Aeneid*'s epic voice does not speak the whole truth. For example, while the epic voice presents Aeneas' killing of Turnus as victory, a further voice—Aeneas' Homeric role as Achilles—suggests it is closer to defeat. In order to win, this further voice insinuates, Aeneas must sacrifice not only the personal ideals for which he has stood, but the national ideals for which Rome will stand. Thus, if Aeneas' and Turnus'

⁹⁵ See pg 11, note 20 above.

Homeric roles indicate that there are darker things going on in Aeneas and Turnus than first meet the eye, they also indicate that the same is true of the *Aeneid* itself.

Third, while this paper has used the term “Homeric roles” to talk about Aeneas’ and Turnus’ correspondences with Homeric characters, the paper’s five case studies suggest that this term is in fact a flawed one for talking about these correspondences. The first problem with the term arises from the sheer number of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ “Homeric roles.” In Book 12, Aeneas and Turnus play, this paper has argued, a wide range of “Homeric roles”: Aeneas the roles of Agamemnon, Hector, and Achilles; Turnus those of Paris and Hector. However, in the world of the theater—the world from which the “role” metaphor derives—it simply does not work this way. In theater, an actor typically plays one role, and one role alone.⁹⁶ Thus, in a production of *Hamlet*, one actor will play Hamlet, one actor Claudius, and one actor Polonius; one actor will almost certainly not, however, play all three roles. The second, and more intractable, problem with the term arises from the nature of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ “Homeric roles.” When Aeneas and Turnus play a “Homeric role,” they remain fundamentally themselves. While they resemble the Homeric character whose role they are playing in certain ways, they do not resemble them in all ways. Once again, however, it is just the opposite in the case of theatrical roles. When an actor plays a role, he does *not* remain fundamentally himself. On the contrary, he temporarily ceases to be himself and fully becomes his character. In other words, true “roles” seem to require complete correspondence between actor and character. Thus, given these two problems, “Homeric roles” will not do as a term for describing Aeneas’ and Turnus’ correspondences with Homeric characters.

⁹⁶ Admittedly, there are exceptions to this rule (e.g., ancient Greek drama). However, despite such exceptions, the multiple nature of Aeneas’ and Turnus’ “Homeric roles” remains problematic. Even when actors do play multiple roles, they do not play multiple roles at the same time, as Aeneas and Turnus often do (e.g., Aeneas simultaneously plays the “roles” of Homer’s Hector *and* Sophocles’ Ajax when speaking to Ascanius in Book 12).

Fortunately, the paper's five case studies readily suggest a substitute term: "Homeric allusions." In comparison with the term "role," the term "allusion" has far fewer specific parameters. For instance, an allusion implies nothing about the nature of the correspondence between actor and character; it simply implies that a correspondence exists between these two entities. Thus, as a term, "Homeric allusion" comes much closer to describing the phenomenon of Aeneas' and Turnus' correspondences with Homeric characters. When textual signals point to a correspondence between Aeneas and Achilles, for instance, this correspondence does not, in and of itself, reveal anything about Aeneas. Instead, the meaning of the correspondence emerges only through the process of comparing and contrasting the two characters. Ultimately, the Homeric character, as the term "Homeric allusion" correctly suggests, serves more as a point of comparison—more as a foil—for the Vergilian character than as a source of hard and fast meaning.

However, not only do the five case studies point to the greater suitability of "Homeric allusions" as a term for talking about Aeneas' and Turnus' correspondences with Homeric characters, they also point to several "principles" of Homeric allusions. First, a Homeric allusion does not necessarily mean the same thing from character to character. Hence the allusion to Hector in Aeneas' speech to Ascanius highlights Aeneas' emotional limitedness, but the allusion to Hector in Turnus' speech to Juturna highlights Turnus' tragic nobility. Second, and more surprisingly, a Homeric allusion does not always mean the same thing for the same character. Again, when Turnus speaks to Juturna midway through Book 12, the allusion to Hector highlights Turnus' tragic nobility; however, when Turnus supplicates Aeneas at the end of Book 12, the allusion to Hector, as Johnson shows, highlights Turnus' victimization.⁹⁷ Third, Homeric

⁹⁷ Johnson (1976) 115.

allusions do not occur with the same frequency. For instance, the allusion to Achilles in Aeneas' response to Turnus' supplication is part of a pattern of allusions; the allusion to Hector in Aeneas' speech to Ascanius, however, is part of no such pattern. While both types should be thought of as allusions, those that form part of a pattern—those that occur, in other words, with some frequency—may also be thought of, to revive a recently discarded term, as “Homeric roles.”⁹⁸ Thus, Aeneas could be said to play the “Homeric role” of Achilles, and Turnus the “Homeric role” of Hector; but Aeneas could not be said to play the “Homeric role” of Hector.

Like all investigations, this investigation has suffered from certain limitations—limitations that ought to be acknowledged, and, hopefully, learned from. From beginning to end, this paper has focused on Vergilian characters, and, in particular, the correspondence of Vergilian characters with Homeric characters. Throughout, the paper has treated these character-to-character correspondences—these character-to-character allusions—as essentially singular. Consequently, the paper gives the impression that, at any given point, there is one allusion, and one allusion alone, at work. In many instances, however, several allusions work in tandem. For instance, when Aeneas addresses Ascanius, Vergil alludes not only to Homer's Hector, but to Sophocles' Ajax⁹⁹ and possibly even Accius' Ajax.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, when Aeneas responds to Turnus' supplication, Vergil alludes not only to the Achilles of *Iliad* 22, but the Achilles of *Iliad* 24¹⁰¹ and possibly other Homeric characters who receive supplications (Menelaus, Agamemnon,

⁹⁸ Ironically, this revised definition of a “Homeric role” closely corresponds with the definition of a “primary” Homeric role discussed in the Introduction. While both the revised “Homeric role” concept and the “primary” Homeric role concept mean approximately the same thing, the revised “Homeric role” concept is to be preferred inasmuch as it synthesizes the two major concepts of the paper: Homeric roles and allusions.

⁹⁹ See pg 35, note 56 above.

¹⁰⁰ Lyne (1987) 9.

¹⁰¹ While textual signals in Aeneas' response to Turnus' supplication do not suggest an allusion to the Achilles of *Iliad* 24, Turnus' speech, which, based on its own textual signals, emerges as a synthesis of Hector's supplication in *Iliad* 22 and Priam's supplication in *Iliad* 24, suggests that Aeneas' response to Turnus' supplication should be viewed as an allusion both to Achilles' response to Hector's supplication in *Iliad* 22 and to Priam's supplication in *Iliad* 24.

etc.). While the paper's focus on single, rather than multiple, Homeric allusions made the investigation much more manageable, the paper itself would undoubtedly have benefited from consideration of these other allusions.

The paper's second major limitation has been its preference for character-to-character allusions at the expense of other types of allusions. Much as the paper gives the impression that there is only one allusion at work at any given moment, so too does it give the impression that there is only one sort of allusion to study: character-to-character allusions. The reality, however, is that Book 12—and the *Aeneid* itself—boasts other types of allusions besides character-to-character allusions, such as scene-to-scene allusions,¹⁰² simile-to-simile allusions, etc. For example, the duel of Aeneas and Turnus represents a scene-to-scene allusion to the duel of Achilles and Hector; similarly, the simile of Aeneas as a hunting hound represents a simile-to-simile allusion to the simile of Achilles as a hunting hound. Ultimately, while character-to-character allusions made the most sense for this investigation, the paper would no doubt have benefited from the presence of other types of allusions, too.

In the final analysis, despite its limitations, this paper, it is hoped, has advanced in some small measure the discussion of Homeric allusions in the *Aeneid*. For far too long, most scholars have implicitly assumed that Vergil's Homeric allusions are hallmarks of an imitative, rather than creative, poet. For far too long, in short, they have assumed that these allusions are meaningless and insignificant. However, as this paper has worked to show, nothing could be farther from the truth. Contrary to the prevailing scholarly view, Vergil's Homeric allusions represent a creative, meaningful, and significant part of the *Aeneid*. Not only do these allusions play a crucial role in constructing the identity of characters like Aeneas and Turnus; they also

¹⁰² The paper has, at times, made use of scene-to-scene, rather than character-to-character, allusions, as in part of the "Aeneas as Achilles" section (see pp 44-46 above). However, where the paper has made use of scene-to-scene allusions, it has done so only as a means of returning to character-to-character allusions.

play a crucial role in constructing the meaning of the *Aeneid* itself. Ultimately, while scholars may continue to ignore the meaning and significance of Vergil's Homeric allusions, that meaning and significance will not go away any time soon.

Bibliography

- Anderson, W.S. "Virgil's Second *Iliad*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. 88 (1957), pp. 17-30.
- Culler, Jonathan. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975).
- De Bruyn, Frans. "Genre Criticism." *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory*, Irena R. Makaryk ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995) pp. 79-85.
- Else, Gerald F. "Imitation." *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Alex Preminger, Frank J. Warnke, and O. B. Hardison Jr. editors. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 378-381.
- Farrell, Joseph. "The Virgilian Intertext." *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Charles Martindale ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 222-238.
- Feeney, Dennis. "The Taciturnity of Aeneas." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 33, No. 1 (1983), pp. 204-219.
- Fontenrose, Joseph. "Apollo and Sol in the Oaths of Aeneas and Latinus." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (Apr., 1943), pp. 137-138.
- Fränkel, Hermann. *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*. (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1967).
- Galinsky, Karl. "The Anger of Aeneas." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 109, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988), pp. 321-348.
- _____, "Aeneas' Invocation to Sol, (*Aeneid*, XII, 176)," *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 90, No. 4 (Oct., 1969), pp. 453-458.
- Garstang, J. B. "The Tragedy of Turnus." *Phoenix*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Autumn, 1950), pp. 47-58.
- Gransden, K. W. *Virgil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- Griffin, Jasper. *Homer on Life and Death*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).
- Heinz, Richard. *Vergil's Epic Technique*, tr. David Harvey, Hazel Harvey, and Fred Robertson. (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993).
- Highbarger, E. L. "The Tragedy of Turnus: A Study of Vergil, *Aeneid* XII." *The Classical Weekly*, Vol. 41, No. 8 (Jan. 19, 1948), pp. 114-124.
- Hightet, Gilbert. *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972).
- Hinds, Stephen. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Johnson, W. R. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976).
- _____, "Aeneas and the Ironies of *Pietas*." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 60, No. 8 (May, 1965), pp. 360-364.
- King, Katherine. "Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's *Aeneid*." *Materiali e*

- discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 9 (1982), pp. 31-57.
- Kirk, G. S. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: Books 1-4*, G. S. Kirk ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- MacKay, L. A. "Achilles as Model for Aeneas." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 88, (1957), pp. 11-16.
- _____, "Hero and Theme in the *Aeneid*." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 94, (1963), pp. 157-166.
- Manning, Clarence A. and George Nakashidse. "Genres." *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, Alex Preminger, Frank J. Warnke, and O. B. Hardison Jr. editors. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), pp. 307-309.
- Moseley, Nicholas. "Pius Aeneas." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 7 (Apr., 1925), pp. 387-400.
- Munro, David B. and Thomas W. Allen. *Homeri Opera I-II*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920).
- Mynors, R. A. B. *Vergili Opera*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969).
- Otis, Brooks. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1964).
- Pascal, C. Bennett. "The Dubious Devotion of Turnus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-), Vol. 120, (1990), pp. 251-268.
- Putnam, Michael C. J. *The Poetry of the Aeneid: Four Studies in Imaginative Design*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).
- Redfield, James M. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994).
- Richardson, Nicholas. *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume VI: Books 21-24*, G. S. Kirk ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Schlunk, Robin R. *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil*. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1974).
- Servius. *The Commentaries on Aeneid I-II: Volume II*. (American Philological Association, 1946).
- Smith, Steven C. "Remembering the Enemy: Narrative, Focalization, and Vergil's Portrait of Achilles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-), Vol. 129, (1999), pp. 225-262.
- Spaeth, John William Jr. "Hector's Successor in the *Aeneid*." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 6 (Mar., 1951), pp. 277-280.
- Tarrant, R. J. "Aspects of Virgil's Reception in Antiquity." *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Charles Martindale ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 56-72.
- Thornton, Agathe. *The Living Universe: Gods and Men in Virgil's Aeneid*. (New Zealand: University of Otago Press, 1976).

- Van Nortwick, Thomas. "Aeneas, Turnus, and Achilles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-), Vol. 110, (1980), pp. 303-314.
- West, David. "The Deaths of Hector and Turnus." *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Apr., 1974), pp. 21-31.
- Williams, R. Deryck. *Virgil: Aeneid I-VI*. (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2005).
_____, *Virgil: Aeneid VII-XII* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 2006).
- Zeitlin, Froma I. "An Analysis of *Aeneid*, XII, 176-211: The Difference Between the Oaths of Aeneas and Latinus." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 86, No. 4 (Oct., 1965), pp. 337-362.